



CWP-18649-2026

-1-

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

(105)

CWP-18649-2026

Date of Decision: - 01.07.2026

Ravinder Pal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present:- Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari, mandamus or in any other nature thereby directing the respondents to allot the plot of three marla.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had purchased the land from one Pawan Kumar vide registered sale deed dated 19.12.2003. It is further submitted that the mutation has also been entered into in the name of the petitioner and the said land was acquired. It is stated that a notification under Section 6 was issued on 16.07.2007 and thereafter the award was also passed. It is submitted that it is the case of the petitioner that the entire land of the petitioner was



acquired and no land is left in his favour. It is submitted that as per the Haryana Government Policy in case more than 75% of the land is acquired, then, the petitioner is entitled for allotment of a plot. It is further submitted that for the redressal of his grievance, the petitioner had given a representation dated 03.09.2025 (Annexure P-5) to the respondents and no decision on the said representation has been taken till date. It is stated that the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage in case the competent authority of the respondents is directed to decide the representation dated 03.09.2025 (Annexure P-5) in a time bound manner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondents No.2 and 3, on an advance notice given, has submitted that in view of the limited prayer made on behalf of the petitioner, the competent authority of the respondents-State would consider and decide the said representation dated 03.09.2025 (Annexure P-5) within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the copy of the order and in case the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, the necessary relief would also be granted thereupon. It is further submitted that however in case the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritless, then, the said representation would be rejected by passing a speaking order within the aforesaid period of three months.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in view of the above-said statement made on behalf of the respondents-State, the present writ petition be disposed of but the respondents be bound by the said statement.

**CWP-18649-2026****-3-**

5. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of. The respondents-State would be bound by the statement made before this Court.

6. It is, however, clarified that the present order should not be construed to have condoned the limitation, if any. The competent authority of the respondents-State would consider the matter independently and all pleas including the plea of limitation are kept open.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

July 01, 2026
naresh.k

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No