



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

124

CWP-13469-2026

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

HARMANJIT KAUR DECEASED THROUGH LRS ...Petitioner

Vs.

PERMANENT LOK ADALAT UT CHANDIGARH & ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. S.S. Salar, Advocate,
Ms. Tisha Joshi, Advocate and
Mr. Hiten Chugh, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Wasu, Sr. Standing Counsel
for respondent-Chandigarh Housing Board

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 14.07.2023 whereby Ld. Permanent Lok Adalat (for short 'PLA') dismissed her application for want of prosecution. She is further seeking setting aside of order dated 16.12.2025 whereby her restoration application was dismissed. She is also seeking direction to respondents No.2&3 to allot her one flat under oustee quota on the basis of certificate dated 19.12.2023.

2. The petitioner is a resident of District SAS Nagar (Mohali). Her mother (predecessor-in-interest) was an oustee whose land in village Fatehgarh (Madian) was acquired vide award dated 29.03.1967. An

oustee certificate dated 19.12.2013 was issued by respondents. Petitioner's mother was declared eligible for allotment of flats under Oustees Scheme, 2017. She applied for BR flat under the aforementioned scheme. She was issued multiple letters qua availability of EWS flats and non-availability of BR flat. She did not give her consent for allotment of EWS flat. Respondents vide order dated 18.08.2022 rejected her claim for BR flat but kept open option for EWS flat till 30.09.2022. She filed application dated 22.12.2022 before PLA assailing order dated 18.08.2022. Her application was dismissed for non-prosecution on 14.07.2023. On coming to know about the dismissal order, she engaged another counsel and filed for restoration vide application dated 03.06.2025 but her application was dismissed vide order dated 16.12.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that there was no reasonable explanation for non-appearance before PLA which compelled PLA to dismiss the petition for non-prosecution. The application seeking restoration was filed after approximately two years. There is no infirmity in the impugned order. PLA has rightly dismissed application seeking restoration.

4. Considering the submissions of both sides and having scrutinized the record, this Court finds that there was certainly lapse on the part of petitioners. They should be subjected to some costs, however, it would be harsh not to restore their petition. They deserve to be heard on merit. Accordingly, impugned order is hereby set aside and PLA is hereby requested to adjudicate the matter on merit subject to payment of

costs of Rs.10,000/- by petitioners to be deposited with PLA. The parties at the first instance would appear before PLA on 13.05.2026 and thereafter as directed by PLA.

5. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

May 04, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No