



CWP-11067-2022

1

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

(274)

CWP-11067-2022

Date of Decision : 22.04.2026

Narinder Pal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Tushar Garg, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate
for respondent No.1-U.T. Chandigarh.

Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh Walia, AAG, Punjab
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the legality of order(s) dated 07.07.2021 (Annexure P-1), dated 28.02.2022 (Annexure P-4), and dated 20.04.2022 (Annexure P-5), vide which, the petitioner was called upon to deposit Rs.7,25,451/-, 7,25,451/- and Rs.11,76,949/-, respectively, along with interest @ 12%. Further, a prayer is made for issuance of a *mandamus*, upon the respondents, to waive off the penal rent and arrears of licence fee, and interest thereupon, for retaining the Govt. Accommodation bearing House No.T-11/2225, Sector-19, Chandigarh, beyond his entitlement.



CWP-11067-2022

2

2. It is not under dispute that the petitioner has retained the above said allotted Govt. accommodation for more than five years, even after his retirement, and failed to deposit the dues, as per the relevant rules.

3. On one hand, the petitioner is creating a doubt regarding missing of the record with regard to calculation, and on the other hand, he has made a request to waive off the penal rent and arrears of licence fee, and interest thereupon, and therefore, he cannot blow hot and cold in the same breath. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to satisfy this Court, that what prejudice, in case of non-availability of the records, specifically when the photocopies of the records is available with the department concerned.

4. No other arguments were raised before this Court.

5. This Court does not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order(s). Furthermore, it is a case of overstay in the Govt. accommodation, for more than five years after retirement, and learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to point out any plausible legal backing for the petitioner to retain the said house, for such a long period, without any authorisation.

6. Consequently, finding no merit, the instant writ petition is, **dismissed.**

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

April 22, 2026
Manpreet

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