



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

207

CWP-20164-2017

DATE OF DECISION: 18.11.2025

M/S GINNI ENTERPRISES

... Petitioner (s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Amit Jhanjhi, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Eliza Gupta, Advocate and
Ms. Kudrit Kaur Sara, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 20.09.2016 (Annexure P-10) whereby the application of the petitioner for allotment of an industrial plot has been rejected and the order dated 10.10.2016 (Annexure P-11) wherein it is mentioned that the industrial plots will be allotted through e-auction only.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had been running a dyeing unit. A decision had been taken by the respondents to relocate the dyeing units located in residential areas to the industrial area carved out in Sectors 29, Part II and Sector 30, Panipat, and therefore, he was entitled to allotment of an industrial plot carved out in those sectors. The petitioner had applied for allotment of an industrial plot on 08.08.2007 but the respondents have erroneously denied allotment on the pretext of a dispute between the

partners although the dispute itself had been resolved on 14.01.2014. He, therefore, submits that there was no impediment in allotment of the plot to the petitioner. He has also referred to the communication from Estate Officer, Panipat dated 05.05.2009 (Annexure P-4) wherein it is mentioned that request of the petitioner ought to have been considered after the dispute is resolved.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents while referring to the written statement submits that allotment to the petitioner could not be made on account of pendency of the dispute among the partners of the dyeing unit. The application had been made in the name of the petitioner company by one Jitender Kumar Khurana but one Nawal Kishore Jindal had raised an objection that plot be not allotted to Jitender Kumar Khurana but to him as he was the proprietor of the firm. The civil suit remained pending and therefore, when allotment was made to others, the same benefit could not be extended to the petitioner.

4. Heard

5. The petitioner is stated to be running a dyeing industrial unit. Some of the dyeing units were stated to be running in residential areas and causing pollution. A decision was taken by the respondents to shift them to the newly carved out Sector 29 and Sector 30, Panipat. Allotment is stated to have been made to those who were running the units but in the case of the petitioner, due to pendency of the civil dispute in relation to the proprietorship of the dyeing unit, allotment could not be made. It is manifest that a civil suit had been preferred by one Nawal Kishore Jindal against one Jitender Kumar Khurana on 04.03.2009 and both of whom claimed to be the proprietor of M/s Ginni Enterprises. The suit had been disposed of in terms of the compromise arrived at between the

parties on 14.01.2014. In the meantime, the respondents had formulated a Policy wherein it was stipulated that allotment of industrial plots would be made only pursuant to an e-auction. When the allotment in the case of other similarly situated persons had been made, there was a dispute with regard to the partnership of petitioner, which was resolved only in 2014. This Court, by the order dated 31.01.2024, while referring to the submission of the counsel for the petitioner that it is willing to pay the current price of the plot, had directed the counsel for the respondents to seek instructions as to whether, this offer is acceptable to them. The respondents by way of an affidavit of Vijay Kumar, E.O., HSVP, Panipat dated 04.11.2024 had stated that after the Policy dated 20.09.2016, allotment of industrial plots is to be made only through e-auction, and therefore, the offer cannot be accepted.

6. In view of the above, we do not find any manifest illegality in the impugned orders rejecting the application of the petitioner. Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

18.11.2025
SwarnjitS

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