



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

103

CWP-219-2023

Date of Decision: 13.05.2026

SHIV GANGAY CONTRACTOR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Ms. Monika Puri, Advocate and
Mr. Akhil Saini, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Arnav Goel, Advocate
For respondent No.3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to clear payment with respect to work carried out by it.

2. The petitioner is a proprietorship firm. It claims that it has carried out work for Gram Panchayat, Neemka. The respondents despite completion of work are not making payment.



3. Learned counsel for the respondents submit that petitioner could not furnish requisite documents, thus, claim was not accepted. The respondents have also found that many officials in connivance with contractors have created false bills or violated prescribed procedure. An FIR has been registered against erring officials. The petitioner cannot be made payment unless and until it furnishes concrete documents in support of its claim.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. From the perusal of reply filed by Block Development and Panchayat Officer, it appears that respondents are not primarily disputing whether petitioner has actually carried out work or not. The dispute is primarily concerned with submission of documents and certification of work. The petitioner has failed to submit proper bills as well as measurement book. The respondents are denying payment primarily on the ground that neither work order was issued nor work was sanctioned by the competent authority. If actual execution of work is not disputed, the State has no authority to deny payment because petitioner has carried out work at the behest of persons holding public post. It had no ground to disbelieve their commitments.

6. In the backdrop, the petition stands disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to furnish evidence of carrying out of work and invoices in support of its claim. The respondent shall consider petitioner's claim. If it is found that petitioner has actually carried out work, the payment in accordance with prescribed State Government standards shall be made. The



Municipal Commissioner, Faridabad in consultation with BDPO concerned would examine the matter.

7. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

13.05.2026
SDK

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No