



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

LPA-584-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision :18.03.2026

M/s Pupneja Rice Mills, Jalalabad

...Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Karan Nehra, Advocate and Mr. Abhay Josan, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Yatin Bunker, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate for respondent No.2.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 28.01.2021 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in CWP-8425-2018.

2. Keeping in view the last order passed, certain calculations have been given by the respondent No.2 qua the effect that in case, the benefit of One Time Settlement Policy of 2017 had been extended to the appellant on the terms and conditions of said policy and the appellant would have deposited the amount of first installment as required under law in the year 2018, what would be the total amount of interest which the appellant would have paid.



3. The said calculations have been brought on record by way of an affidavit of District Manager, Pungrain, Fazilka as Annexure R-1 the same is taken on record.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the said calculations are acceptable to the appellant and the amount will be deposited by the appellant in terms of Annexure R-1.

5. As per the said calculations, in case the due permission would have been given to the appellant to deposit the amount in the year 2017 and such amount would have been deposited by the appellant, the appellant was required to pay a sum of Rs.16,78,521/- as interest.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that though, the said calculations have been made but the amount remained with the appellant and therefore, the same should also carry interest up to now so that the respondents do not suffer any prejudice.

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

8. It may be noticed that as per the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court, the non-grant of one time settlement, as asked by the appellant, was attributable to the respondents. It was due to an act of the respondents that the money which was required to be paid by the appellant under one time settlement could not be deposited. Even then, in order to ensure that the respondents do not face any loss of interest due which comes to be Rs.,16,78,521/- in case, had the OTS approval been given to the appellant at the relevant time, on the asking of this Court, the appellant has agreed to deposit the same. Since the amount so accruable



remained with the appellant due to the pendency of the litigation which litigation had ultimately gone in favour of the appellant only, there is no challenge to the judgment of the learned Single Judge of this Court by the respondents. Hence, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the interest which was directed to be deposited by the learned Single Judge of this Court, will mean a sum of Rs.16,78,521/- to be deposited by the appellant.

9. Learned counsel for the appellant undertakes that the appellant will deposit the said amount within a period of 30 days from today failing which, the interest on such amount will be paid @ 10% per annum compounded till the date of actual payment. It is made clear that any security retained by the respondent-department, will be released upon deposit of the amount by the appellant within time frame granted.

9. Present appeal stands disposed of in above terms.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

March 18, 2026

aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No