



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

106

CWP-16497-2025 (O & M)  
Date of decision: 29.05.2025

Viraj Malviya

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

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

Mr. Ravi Pratap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Learned counsel submits that the agreement to sell between the petitioner and Rekha Mehta on one hand and Suraj Subhash Chandra on the other was executed which could not fructify and as such, claim for refund of e-stamp papers purchased on 16.09.2022, Annexures P-4 and P-5, was made but has been rejected merely on the ground of it being time barred under Section 50 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899. The delay in making request was due to the fact that the husband of the petitioner fell critically ill and was admitted in a Multi-Super Specialty Hospital, Gurugram, on 31.12.2022 where he remained under intensive care for nearly a month before being discharged on 28.01.2023, suffering from urological issues, including urinary incontinence and burning micturition, among other complications, discharge summary has been appended as Annexure P-6. In the meantime, even the petitioner herself also became unwell and was admitted in the same hospital on 19.01.2023 with severe

bilateral knee pain, debilitating lower back pain, dysuria, fever and other associated complications, discharge summary dated 30.01.2023 has been attached as Annexure P-7, whereafter her husband again suffered yet another health set back and was admitted for 20 days till 19.02.2023, as is discernible from discharge summary, Annexure P-8. He prays for re-consideration of the matter taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and documents in a time bound manner.

2. The aforesaid facts having been brought out, during the course of hearing, learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the respondents would not be averse to have a relook at the matter and decide afresh, taking note of the aforesaid submissions, within a period of 8 weeks, uninfluenced by the order(s) impugned in the present case, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

3. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. The matter stands disposed of accordingly and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to her interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to her and shall contain reasons, whereupon she shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

29.05.2025

parveen kumar

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

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