



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.9569 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :03.04.2025**

Sonia

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present : Mr. Sunpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral):

Petitioner (Sonia) prays for a certiorari to quash the notice dated 24.03.2025, issued by the Municipal Corporation, Zone-A, Ludhiana, for she is alleged to have raised unauthorized construction upon the subject property in violation of the Punjab Building By laws. And has been granted 15 days to appear in the office of the Corporation along with the approved map/compromise fee/proof of ownership (copy of sale deed) and submit her defence, failing which, necessary action, to remove the unauthorized construction, would be taken, under Punjab Municipal Corporation Act, 1976 .

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in occupation and possession of a residential House No.13, near Badri Karyana Store, Peeru Bada Mohalla, Ludhiana. And, upon receipt of the impugned notice, she had already submitted a response within the stipulated period on 29.03.2025, and also appeared before the respondents authorities.



But, neither the matter was heard nor any further date has been notified by the respondents. He submits, for 15 days period indicated in the impugned notice would end on 07.04.2025, the petitioner apprehends, that *de hors* the stand set out in her response, and even without hearing the petitioner, the authorities might seal the premises or demolish the alleged unauthorized construction.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Sartaj Singh Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab, is present in Court on behalf of the respondents. At the outset, he submits, for the competent authority is in seizin of the concerns/grievances of the petitioner not only the response submitted by the petitioner shall be taken into account, but she shall also be heard before any formal orders are passed. Accordingly, he submits that let the petition be disposed of, for the present, to enable the respondents-authorities to examine the matter and pass necessary orders, in accordance with law. He fairly submits that till any such orders are passed, no adverse action shall be initiated against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned State counsel and submits that let this petition be disposed of in terms of the statement made by him.

The petition is, accordingly, disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

This Court is sanguine that the respondents-authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And, appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed at the earliest.



Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the claim/grievance of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

03.04.2025
Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No