



LPA-125-2023 1

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

(223) **LPA-125-2023**
Date of Decision : November 19, 2025

Harjit Singh **.. Appellant**

Versus

State of Punjab and others **.. Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. Vikas Singh, Senior Advocate, with
Ms. Anamika Sheoran, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present appeal, the prayer of the appellant is to set aside the order dated 29.11.2022 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP No.19197 of 2021 by which, the writ petition filed by the petitioner has been dismissed on the ground of locus standi.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant competed along with respondent No.6 i.e. Rajpal Singh for allotment of land measuring 30 kanals 4 marlas comprising in Khasra No.56//10 (7-11), 11 (7-11), 20/1 (2-15), 20/2 (4-16), 21 (7-11) situated within revenue estate of Village Killa Hakima, Tehsil Dhuri, District Sangrur auctioned through restricted auction on 23.12.1982, which land was allotted to respondent No.6- Rajpal Singh against the bid of Rs.1,04,200/- paying the last installment, sale certificate was issued to respondent No.6-Rajpal Singh on 25.05.2010 but against the terms and conditions of the allotment and by violating Rule 6 (8) of the Punjab Package Deal Properties (Disposal) Rules, 1976, he had sold the same to respondent No.7 vide registered sale deed dated 16.02.2011 hence, the

**LPA-125-2023****2**

prayer of the appellant was that the said allotment should be cancelled as the terms and conditions of the allotment have been violated so that the said land allotment in favour of respondent No.6-Rajpal Singh be cancelled and that the respondent be restricted from making an alienation of land.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the said fact has been ignored by the learned Single Judge to hold that the appellant has no locus to challenge the same.

4. Respondents No.6 and 7 have not been served.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the appellant submits that he has already filed an application/representation with the State qua the grievance raised in the writ petition and the respondents be directed to decide the same by passing speaking order in a time bound manner.

6. Learned State counsel submits that in case any such grievance has been raised by the appellant and the same is still pending, it will be decided by passing an appropriate speaking order within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

7. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that keeping in view the statement made by learned State counsel, the present appeal may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

8. Ordered accordingly.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

November 19, 2025
harsha

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No