



CWP-12457-2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

117

CWP-12457-2026

Date of Decision:24.04.2026

SUKHDEEP KAUR AND ANR

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURIPresent: Mr. Mohit Jaggi, Advocate and
Ms. Nishtha, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Akhil Kamra, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Karina Kalra, Advocate for
Ms. Avin Sandhu, Advocate,
for respondent No.2-GMADA.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioners have challenged the demand of Rs.29,85,938/- on account of Preferential Location Charges (PLC) imposed by the respondent-GMADA.
2. Counsel for the petitioners submits that in the judgment passed by this Court in **Daulat Ram Bhatti Vs. State of Punjab and others** Law ***Finder Doc ID #2699039***, the imposition of Preferential Location Charges has been held to be illegal. The operative part of judgment reads as follows:

“12. In aftermath, there is merit in the instant writ petitions. Hence, all the writ petitions are allowed, and, the impugned condition as raised by the respondent



CWP-12457-2026

-2-

concerned, i.e. PLC charges (attached at the end of Annexure P-4 in the instant case) is quashed and set aside.

13. It is clarified that in case any of the petitioner(s) have deposited the charge (as claimed in the allotment letter), thus they are entitled to get the refund of the same. Accordingly, the GMADA is directed to, vis-a-vis the petitioners concerned, but within 2 months from today refund the impugned amounts, if deposited by the petitioner(s), thus before them, with simple interest @ 6% per annum from the date of such deposit(s).

14. It is further clarified that the respondent concerned, shall within 2 weeks from today ensure the delivery of encumbrance free possession of the subject plots to the petitioners concerned, besides shall also within a fortnight from today ensure that the deeds of conveyance are executed vis-a-vis the subject plots qua the petitioners herein.”

3. Although, counsel for respondent No.2-GMADA concedes that case is covered by the judgment of this Court in ***Daulat Ram Bhatti's case (supra)***, but she states that a review application has been filed therein, which is pending. She submits that, in case, order passed in ***Daulat Ram Bhatti's case (supra)*** is recalled, this matter would also stand covered with the orders passed in the review application.

4. Consequently, the instant petition is allowed and the impugned allotment letter dated 18.10.2019 (Annexure P-4) is set aside to the extent that Preferential Location Charges have been imposed.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
sheetal

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

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