



207 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

LPA-1161-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.02.2026

Gianender Ahlawat

...Appellant

Vs.

Union Territory of Chandigarh and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present: Mr. Sankalp Gehlawat, Advocate for
Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate
Mr. Himanshu Arora, Advocate
Ms. Kiranpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the respondent-U.T.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This appeal pertains to the year 2021. Considering that the matter is more than five years old, we are not inclined to accept the request for adjournment made on behalf of Mr. Sankalp Gehlawat, learned counsel appearing for the appellant.

2. This appeal arises out of an order passed by learned Single Judge dated 25.11.2021, which reads as under:-

"The petitioner has been allotted a Government house in Sector 22-A, Chandigarh.

There is a vacant space outside the boundary wall of the house which has been allotted to the petitioner. The petitioner has developed the aforesaid area and fenced it with plants. The UT Administration is now planning to uniformly develop the green belt in the area.

The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that if such development is permitted, he will not be left with any passage. Sh. Anil Mehta, Senior Standing Counsel representing the Union Territory, Chandigarh, has



submitted that 12 feet wide passage is being provided.
The petitioner is neither the owner nor the licensee of the green belt.
Hence, the petitioner does not have any exclusive right to use the aforesaid property.
Dismissed.
All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of."

3. The writ petition has been filed challenging the action of Chandigarh Administration in developing green belt in front of House No. 21 to 34, Sector 22-A, Chandigarh. The petitioner is not the owner of the house but is merely an allottee of the official premises.
4. We do not find any right in the appellant to object to the development of green belt in front of his house. The respondents otherwise have clearly stated that 12 feet wide ingress and egress is provided to the respondent.
5. In such circumstances, the dismissal of writ petition by the learned Single Judge does not require any interference.
6. The Letters Patent Appeal is accordingly **dismissed**.
7. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

13.02.2026
neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No