



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

CWP-18379-2025

Date of decision : 18.08.2025

Ranjana Thukral

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ravinder Bangar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate and
Ms. Aashna Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(Oral)

The petitioner has impugned the order dated 04.07.2024 (Annexure P-6), whereby the representation preferred by her has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had placed the highest bid in the e-auction conducted on 23.11.2022, but the same was not accepted although it met the criteria and was more than the reserve price. He submits that in the case of plot No.381 (Annexure P-4), a similar bid had been accepted by the respondents. He also submits that in regard the 6 marla plot category, even those bids had been accepted which were marginally higher than the reserve price.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents, who has put in an appearance

on advance notice, submits that the bid of the petitioner was marginally above the reserve price of Rs.49,81,000/- and therefore, it was rejected. The competent authority had taken a decision that only those bids would be accepted, which are more than the valuation arrived at after reducing 20% from the current average auction price. In the case of 8 marla plots, the valuation after applying the aforesaid ratio had been assessed at Rs.52,46,640/-. In the case of Plot No.381, the bid of Rs.54,11,000/- had been submitted which was more than Rs.52,46,640/- and therefore, the bid had been accepted. He also submits that the petitioner had applied for a plot in the '8 marla' category whereas the accepted bids which had been relied upon by the petitioner are in the '6 marla' plot category.

4. Heard.

5. The petitioner had participated in an auction conducted by the respondents on 23.11.2022. She had made a bid of Rs.49,91,000/- against the reserve price of Rs.49,81,000/-. Her bid was the highest for the plot, but the same has not been accepted by the respondents. The respondents have accepted only those bids, which were higher than the valuation arrived after reducing 20% from the current average auction price. The competent authority had fixed the figure at Rs.52,46,640/- for the category of plots in which the petitioner had made a bid i.e. the 8 marla plot category in Sector-19, Part-I, Sirsa. The bid of the petitioner being less than Rs.52,46,640/- had been rejected. Similarly, the bids of two other persons were also rejected being less than Rs.52,46,640/- although their bids were higher than the reserve price.

6. We do not find any infirmity and illegality in the auction conducted by the respondents as well as their decision to reject the bid as it was

only marginally above the reserve price and less than the figure arrived after reducing the average auction price by 20% (Rs.52,46,640/-), as the bid of the petitioner was only for Rs.49,91,000/-. Furthermore, the Earnest Money deposited by the petitioner had been refunded to him on 10.01.2023.

7. Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.
8. All pending miscellaneous application(s) shall also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

18.08.2025
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No