



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.28249 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.11.2025

Promila

.... Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Shubham Malik, Advocate, for
Mr. Jagbir Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J (Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, a challenge is thrown to the order dated 15.09.2025 (Annexure P-6), passed by respondent No.3, vide which the petitioner was directed to vacate her currently allotted Government accommodation.
2. On 22.09.2025, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order:

“Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the order dated 15.09.2025 (Annexure P-6), passed by respondent no.3, through which the petitioner was directed to vacate her currently allotted government accommodation, on account of posting of an IAS officer, in the District concerned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order is best example of a colourable exercise of the administrative power.

He further submits that there is no rule which governs the conditions of allotment of government accommodation, entitling the authority concerned to pass an order of eviction or cancellation, the moment any senior officer joins in the District concerned.

He next submits that the officer who has passed the impugned order is the same, to whom the said government accommodation has now been allotted, which is a clear mala fide on his part.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl.AG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of all the respondents, and waives service.



He seeks time to have apt instructions from the quarter concerned, in order to inform this Court, as to which rules empowered respondent no.3, to pass the impugned order.

Asked for request is accepted.

Adjourned to 30.10.2025.

Reply, if any, be also filed on behalf of respondents concerned, on or before the next date of hearing, with a copy in advance to learned counsel opposite.

In the meanwhile, operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed during the pendency of the instant petition.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that no further request for an adjournment shall be entertained on the next date of hearing, on behalf of either of the parties.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondents fairly concedes before this Court that the order (supra), was passed without making compliance with the principles of natural justice, as no show cause notice was issued to the petitioner before passing the same. Even the issue, whether the house in question is earmarked or is the only available house in the city, would also require to be examined. In view of this lapse, the impugned order has now been withdrawn through a letter dated 10.11.2025, a photocopy of which is taken on record as “Mark-X”. It is also submitted that further action, if any, would be taken after making due compliance with the provisions of law.

4. Since the order (supra), which caused grievance to the petitioner, stands withdrawn, the prayer made in the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

5. **Dismissed** as having been **rendered infructuous**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

11.11.2025
deepak

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