



CWP-35022-2025

-1-

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

104

CWP-35022-2025

Date of decision : 28.11.2025

Yudhvir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Mohit Rathee, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has impugned the order dated 01.05.2017 (Annexure P-11) whereby his application for allotment of a plot under the oustee quota has been declined.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied for allotment of a plot under the oustee quota as his land measuring 15 biswas had been acquired by the respondents in the year 2006 for the construction of Sector Road, Sector 7-37, Rohtak, but the respondents have arbitrarily rejected his application although he had deposited a sum of Rs.50,000/- as well. In the alternative, he submits that the amount of Rs.50,000/- along with reasonable interest be refunded to him.

3. Issue notice to the respondents.

4. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl.A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the



CWP-35022-2025

-2-

petitioner is challenging the order after about 08 years and he had not applied afresh pursuant to the advertisements issued by the respondents on several occasions after 2011.

5. Heard.

6. The petitioner was stated to be owner of 15 biswas of land which was acquired by the respondents vide notification dated 15.12.2006 for the construction of Sector Road of Sector 7-37, Rohtak. The petitioner is stated to have submitted an application on 27.12.2011 along with earnest amount of Rs.50,000/- for allotment of 06 marla plot under the 'oustee quota' but he did not get the relief. He had preferred a writ petition bearing CWP-21285-2016 which was disposed of on 07.10.2016 by directing the respondents to pass a speaking order within 03 months on the legal notice of the petitioner. The impugned order declining the legal notice was passed on 01.05.2017 which was once again challenged by the petitioner in CWP-20829-2017, which was disposed of vide order dated 15.03.2018 granting liberty to the petitioner to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the pleas and the respondents were directed to decide the same in terms of the judgment of the Full Bench of this Court in CWP-22252-2016, titled as '**Rajiv Manchanda and others versus Haryana Urban Development Authority, Panchkula and others**', decided on 22.11.2017.

7. It is apparent that after disposal of the aforesaid writ petition on 15.03.2018, the petitioner did not take further action and instead approached this Court after 07 years. In the meantime, the respondents are stated to have issued several advertisements inviting the applications for allotment of plot(s)



CWP-35022-2025

-3-

under the oustee quota but the petitioner did not respond thereto and it would be difficult to accept the claim of the petitioner at this stage.

8. However, it is not in dispute that the petitioner had indeed deposited an amount of Rs.50,000/- along with his application in the year 2011. The respondents would be required to refund the money along with interest thereon in terms of their policy.

9. Consequently, the petition is partly allowed and the respondents are directed to refund the amount of Rs.50,000/- along with interest @ 5.5% p.a. in terms of their policy within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

November 28, 2025
sonia gugnani

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