



CWP-12151-2026

-1-

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

(138)

CWP-12151-2026

Date of decision:- 06.05.2026

Anuja Singhal and another

... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present:- Mr. Vikram Singh Punia, Advocate and
Mr. Amit Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana,
for the respondents.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ of certiorari quashing order dated 27.03.2026, Annexure P-10, passed by Administrator, Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP), Rohtak, whereby statutory appeal filed by petitioners under Section 20 of the Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran Act, 1977 (for short "the 1977 Act"), has been dismissed.
2. Mr. Vikram Singh Punia, counsel for the petitioners states that petitioners are the owners in possession of land measuring 10 kanal 11 marlas in village Rasoi, Tehsil and District Sonapat, which was acquired by the respondents vide notifications issued under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

**CWP-12151-2026****-2-**

An award dated 24.11.2004, Annexure P-1, was passed by the Land Acquisition Collector, but according to Mr. Punia, petitioners never came to know about the acquisition till respondent No.4 issued a public notice regarding unauthorized possession over land. Counsel states that respondent No.4 issued notices, Annexure P-6 as well as Annexure P-7, for eviction of unauthorized occupants and by order dated 25.04.2025, Annexure P-8, they were directed to vacate the land. Counsel points out that petitioners filed a statutory appeal under the 1977 Act, which has been rejected by the Administrator, HSVP, Rohtak vide impugned order, Annexure P-10, without applying an independent mind and without consideration of the material placed on record. It is his contention that petitioners had submitted numerous documents along with the appeal to establish that they continue to be in possession of the land, however, appeal has been declined by passing a non-speaking order.

3. On advance notice, Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana, has appeared on behalf of the respondents and has supported the impugned order. He submits that by virtue of passing of award, Annexure P-1, land has vested in the State and petitioners, who are in illegal possession of acquired land, are liable to be evicted.

4. After having heard counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that the impugned order deserves to be set aside and the matter has to be remanded back to the appellate authority. An analysis of the impugned order reveals that various factual assertions raised by petitioners have not been considered by the appellate authority. Order, Annexure P-10,



CWP-12151-2026

-3-

does not reflect adequate consideration of the documents submitted by petitioners. In the nine page order, appellate authority has primarily reproduced the rival stand of both the parties and in the last paragraph running into few sentences, it has recorded its conclusion while dismissing the appeal.

5. It is a settled position of law that an order affecting the civil rights of a party must satisfy the principles of natural justice and material placed before the authority should be duly considered before any adverse order is passed. Hon'ble Supreme Court in M/s Kranti Associates Private Limited and another Versus Masood Ahmed Khan and others, (2010) 9 SCC 496, emphasized that recording of reasons is an indispensable component of a fair decision making process. Similarly, in Siemens Engineering & Manufacturing Co. of India Limited Versus Union of India and another, (1976) 2 SCC 981, it has been held that *quasi* judicial authorities are required to pass reasoned orders reflecting due application of mind. However, as observed above, the appellate authority has failed to pass a reasoned order. As the impugned order does not reflect any application of mind, the same cannot be sustained.

6. For the afore-going reasons, impugned order dated 27.03.2026, Annexure P-10, is set aside. Matter is remitted to the appellate authority for passing a fresh order in accordance with law after affording an effective opportunity of personal hearing to petitioners and permitting them to place on record any additional material they intend to rely upon in support of their assertion. Appellate authority shall pass a reasoned order after considering the material relied upon by the petitioners within a period of four months from the



CWP-12151-2026

-4-

date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

7. Petition is disposed of.
8. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy and all issues have been left open to be considered independently by the appellate authority in accordance with law.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
Kamal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No