

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025.PHHC:173261-DB



CWP-33615-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.12.2025

Jaswant Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

Public Urban Planning & Development Authority & Anr. ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Puneet Jindal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Malvi Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ratik Chatrath Kapur, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner claims to have established an industrial colony on a piece of land measuring 10.29 acres in District Jalandhar.
2. He is aggrieved by the impugned order whereby the plan for approval of such industrial colony has been rejected. The appellate authority has also non-suited the petitioner.
3. The primary reason assigned in the order impugned for non-suiting the petitioner is that the requisite information/details with regard to establishment of industrial colony, has not been furnished by the petitioner.
4. It transpires that under a regularization policy, the petitioner had earlier applied on 14.10.2013 before the respondents' authorities for regularizing his industrial colony. This plan was rejected on 14.06.2016. The petitioner was later informed that in case he applies under the new policy, his claim can be considered. It is thereafter that the petitioner deposited the requisite charges in the subsequent policy yet the plan was not approved. It was in this context that the petitioner approached the appellate authority which has rejected the appeal after

noticing that the appeal itself has been filed belatedly and that requisite information/details were found lacking for consideration of petitioner's claim on merits.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we find that there is no consideration of the petitioner's claim for regularization of industrial colony on merits. The reasons assigned are that regularization plan with requisite details has not been furnished.

6. Without entering into the merits of the respective contentions, we are inclined to dispose of this writ petition, at this stage, with the observation that if the petitioner files his regularization plan along with all requisite details, as were previously demanded by the respondents, together a copy of this order within two weeks from today, the authorities/respondent No.2 shall accord consideration to the petitioner's claim in accordance with the Building Bye-Laws/approved norms by passing a fresh order within a period of two months, thereafter. It is clarified that if the petitioner avails of the liberty granted today vide this order, the previous orders passed against the petitioner shall not stand in the way of fresh consideration of cause, in accordance with law. It is clarified that we have not adjudicated the petitioner's claim on merits and the authority concerned shall be at liberty to take appropriate decision in accordance with law.

7. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

11.12.2025
rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	:	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	:	Yes/No