

2026-PHC-041897



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

CWP-31818-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.03.2026

Ravinder Jit Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

Chandigarh Administration and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumeet Jain, Additional Standing Counsel, and
Mr. Sahil Garg, Panel Counsel,
for respondents No.1 to 3.

Ms. Sweta Chahal, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1) With a prayer to issue a Mandamus upon the respondents to release/discharge respondent No.4, who stood surety/guarantor for late husband of the petitioner, namely Sh. Harinder Pal Singh, being posted in the office of Government Press, U.T., Chandigarh, as a Binder, she has knocked the doors of this Court by way of instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

2) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits, in nutshell, that the respondent-Department had issued a letter dated 12.12.2022 (Annexure P-3), vide which, recovery of Rs.7,97,766/-, as outstanding dues in relation to the house allotted to the deceased husband of the petitioner, was sought to be effected. And, a copy thereof, was also forwarded to respondent No.4, being surety/guarantor. Fetching grievance from the abovesaid recovery notice, the petitioner had approached this Court by way of CWP-2249-2023. Accordingly, upon consideration of the matter, a Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide order

2026-PHC-041897



dated 17.01.2025, quashed the impugned notice, and allowed the writ petition. Aggrieved, the respondent-Department preferred an intra-Court appeal (LPA-1070-2025), in which, notice has been issued, but stay has not been granted, till date. However, he submits that, at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied if she is allowed to substitute the guarantor, to the satisfaction of the competent authority.

3) In response, Mr. Sumeet Jain, learned Additional Standing Counsel, for the respondent-U.T., Chandigarh, fairly submits that in the event, the petitioner moves an appropriate application in this regard, the same shall be considered and decided sympathetically.

4) In view of the abovesaid fair stand set out by learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 3, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, with a Mandamus that in case the petitioner moves the competent authority by way of an apt application within a week from today, the latter shall consider and decide the same, within 15 days thereafter, in accordance with law.

5) However, it is clarified that this Court has not opined anything with regard to the validity of the notice, which, as referred to above, is *sub judice* before the LPA Bench.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

16.03.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No