



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

1(2)

Decided on : 31.10.2025

**CM-1524-LPA-2021 in/and
RA-LP-14-2021 in/and
LPA-327-2021 (O&M)**

LALIT MEHTA

Appellant

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

LPA-356-2021 (O&M)

BALDEV SINGH AND ANOTHER

Appellants

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI**

**PRESENT: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rajnish Gupta, Advocate for the applicant/appellant.**

Ms. Anu Pal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

CM-1524-LPA-2021

**The prayer in the present application is for condonation of delay
of 51 days in filing the review application i.e. RA-LP-14-2021.**

Keeping in view the averments enumerated in the application,



which are duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, the delay of 51 days in filing the review application i.e. **RA-LP-14-2021** is condoned.

RA-LP-14-2021 in LPA-327-2021

1. In the present review application, the prayer of the review applicant is for reviewing the order dated 26.03.2021 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in LPA-327-2021.

2. Learned Senior counsel for the review applicant submits that once, the original plan for lying down high extension wire did not had any hindrance, the same could not have been substituted by an another plan which is causing prejudice to the applicant/appellant as in the revise plan the high extension wires are passing over the land of the review applicant.

3. Learned senior counsel for the review applicant further submits that the said change of the plan was not bonafide but due to the incorrect information of SDO namely Vinod, who has also been charge-sheeted, therefore, the authorities should be directed that the original plan should be adhered to rather than the revised plan for lying down the high extension wires.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that first plan was only a proposal which was finalised later on with the revised plan and the revised plan has not only been executed but is even commissioned since January, 2021.

5. We have heard learned senior counsel for the review applicant as well as the counsel for respondents-State and have gone through the case



file with their able assistance.

6. It may be mentioned that the review is not for rehearing of the case so as to come at a different conclusion than the one arrived at earlier in the order dated 26.03.2021. Further, the review is only permissible, in case, any fact which was not in the knowledge of the review applicant despite due diligence, have come to the notice of such review applicant so as to press the same into review so as to recall the order.

7. In the present review application, the only endeavor of the learned Senior counsel for the review applicant is to reargue the appeal so as to convince this Court to come at a different conclusion than the one arrived at by the Co-ordinate Division Bench of this Court on the basis of same facts which were already existed at the time of passing the order dated 26.03.2021, the review of which order has been sought for which cannot be permitted.

8. Further State counsel is still on the same statement that the original plan was a proposal plan which was later on revised by the competent authority while findings the same and the said finalised plan has already been implemented and commissioned since, January, 2021.

10. That being so, even on the asking of the review applicant, the said finalised plan which has already been executed and commissioned cannot be revised as of now and that too at the cost of State Exchequer without there being any valid reason.

11. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court for review of the order dated 26.03.2021 in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

**CM-1524-LPA-2021 in/and
RA-LP-14-2021 in/and
LPA-327-2021 (O&M)
AND CONNECTED CASES**

⁴
2025:PHHC:150231-DB



14. Present review application is dismissed.
15. However, it is made clear that the State will ensure that all the required precautions are being taken by the authorities over the land where the high transmission line are crossing so that no hazard is caused to the property as well as the inhabitants.

LPA-356-2021

16. Keeping in view the reason mentioned in the review application recorded herein above, no order is required to be passed in the present letters patent appeal, hence, the present letters patent appeal is disposed of in terms of the order passed in review application.
17. Pending civil miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.
18. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case(s).

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

**(ARCHANA PURI)
JUDGE**

31.10.2025

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No