



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

(Sr. No. 114)

**CWP No. 18450 of 2025
Date of decision: 20.11.2025**

Navtej Singh Duggal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI**

Present : Mr. Deepak Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Himanshu Raj, Addl. A. G., Punjab.
Ms. Kavita Arora, Advocate for respondent No.6.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

(1) Through this petition the petitioner challenges the rejection of his application filed by him for issuance of Change of Land Use certificate (for short - CLU) for his land.

(2) The petitioner claims to be the grandson of late Sh. Sat Parkash Karoop, a freedom fighter. In the year 1981, Plot No.1, J.P Nagar, outside Patiala Gate, opposite Bhagwan Valmiki Mandir, Sangrur was allotted to the petitioner's mother Smt. Sawarnlata Verma. It was a residential plot on which a house was constructed. In the year 2013 the petitioner's mother died and the aforesaid property was transferred in the petitioner's name as her successor.

(3) The petitioner wanted to seek permission to change the nature of the aforesaid residential property into commercial property and therefore,



applied to the State Government for the change of its use. Such application of his was shown to have been rejected on the online portal of the Government. Since no reason for the rejection of the petitioner's application was forthcoming on the online portal of the State Government, the present petition was filed before this Court challenging the rejection of his application for CLU.

(4) Learned counsel for the parties have been heard and with their assistance the record of the case has also been perused.

(5) It is not disputed that the petitioner had filed an application seeking therein permission to change the use of his residential property to commercial. It is also the admitted position that on 20.04.2023, without supplying of any reasons, all that was conveyed to the petitioner on the online portal of the State Government was that his application stood rejected.

(6) Learned State counsel submits that on 20.04.2023, reasons for rejecting the petitioner's application for CLU could not be uploaded on the website of State Government on account of a technical glitch and the same were later supplied to him through letter dated 12.06.2023. The said letter reads as follows: -

“OFFICE OF ADDITIONAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
(GENERAL), SANGRUR
(Urban Development Branch)

Email: adcud.sangrur@punjab.gov.in

To

Shri Navtej Duggal,
R/o House no. 1, J.P. Nagar,
Sangrur.

No. Urban Development-2023/764
Dated: 12.06.2023

Sub: Regarding the CLU Application no.PB/CLU/SAG/SANGR/2598.



With regard to the subject cited above.

2. Regarding the case under the subject, you filed a petition on the e-Naksha portal to get the CLU of your residence No. 1, J.P. Nagar, Sangrur. As per the report received by this office from the Executive Officer, Improvement Trust, Sangrur, your application has been rejected on 20.04.2023 showing the rejection as under:

However, if the land use of the plots falling under the scheme of the Improvement Trust, Sangrur is permissible as per the Master Plan of Sangrur, then the scheme must be amended under Section 43 of the Punjab Town Improvement Act, 1922.

3. However, due to technical glitches on the e-Naksha portal, the rejection letter could not be uploaded. Provided your demand for the rejection letter, this letter is being issued for the same.

Sd/-

Additional Deputy Commissioner (G),
Sangrur.”

(7) The petitioner denies the receipt of the afore letter. Be that as it may, after reading the contents of the afore letter, we can make no head no tail of the same. It was not possible for us to decipher the reasons so contained therein for rejection of the petitioner’s application for CLU. Therefore, after taking the letter dated 12.06.2023 on the record as Annexure-X, we set it aside with a direction to the competent authority in the State to consider and decide afresh the petitioner’s request for grant of CLU of the property in question, within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order but only after granting him an opportunity of hearing and by passing a reasoned order.

(8) Disposed of.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

20.11.2025

sunil yadav

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

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