



136

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

\*\*\*\*

**CWP-6216-2026 (O&M)****Date of Decision: 30.03.2026**

Vinod Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services), UT Chandigarh and  
Others

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Ms. Shubreet Kaur, Advocate and  
Mr. Varun Dhawan, Advocate  
for respondents No.2 to 4.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Matter was called before as well as after lunch session, however, there is no representation of the petitioner.
2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of orders dated 02.03.2022 and 21.01.2026 whereby Sub Divisional Magistrate (East), exercising powers of Estate Officer-respondent No. 4 has ordered to evict him from seat situated in Tenement No. 729/1, Bapu Dham Colony, Sector 26, Chandigarh. He is further seeking stay of aforesaid orders.
3. The petitioner was running a tailoring shop in a small portion of House No. 729/1, Bapu Dham Colony, Sector 26, Chandigarh.

Chandigarh Administration allotted tenements/sites in this colony on license basis to people who were earlier living in slums. Private Respondent No. 5- Geeta filed an application before Learned Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Service), Chandigarh (for short 'PLA') claiming herself to be owner of House in question. She alleged that petitioner had opened a tailoring shop in her house and is not paying the water charges which accumulated to the tune of ₹80,000/- and connection was disconnected. She prayed for directions to Estate Officer U.T Chandigarh to close commercial activity being carried out by petitioner. The Estate Office in its reply confirmed that allotment letter has not been issued to anyone *qua* house in dispute. PLA vide award dated 23.12.2019 held that petitioner has to pay his share of water bill and if does not comply, Respondent No. 2 and 3 would be at liberty to take action against him. He did not deposit his share amounting to ₹60,862/-. Learned PLA vide order dated 02.03.2022 directed Respondent No.3 to take necessary steps to remove his shop. Respondent No. 5 again submitted an application before PLA on the same cause of action was rejected with costs of ₹10,000/-. Respondent No.4-Estate Officer has passed an eviction order dated 21.01.2026 under section 5 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971.

4. As per petitioner, eviction order is bad because it is based upon order dated 02.03.2022 passed by PLA which passed order beyond its jurisdiction.

5. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4 submits that petitioner may submit his objections before SDM who would consider his grievance and pass fresh order in accordance with law.

6. In the wake of statement of learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, the petition stands ***disposed of*** with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application within three months from today, if cause survives.
7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)  
JUDGE

**30.03.2026**  
*Prince Chawla*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |