



CWP-36990-2025

-1-

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

(120)

CWP-36990-2025

Date of decision:- 10.02.2026

Subhash Chand Saini

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Robin Dutt, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court, *inter-alia*, for issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus, directing respondents to disburse payment of Rs.16 lacs on account of the work executed by the petitioner.
2. Counsel for the petitioner states that respondent No.1 approved the implementation of a project for construction of Water Harvesting Structure, Silt Detention Dam in Block Shehzadpur on an estimate cost of Rs.16 lacs on 05.11.2015, Annexure P-1. He submits that permission to construct the Dam was given vide communication dated 16.03.2016, Annexure P-3. Counsel asserts that petitioner got the work completed and on 02.08.2016, a communication was addressed to the Principal Chief Conservator, Forests to release the amount of Rs.16 lacs to the petitioner. Counsel emphasized that petitioner was incharge of the work as he was posted as Forest Inspector and the work was executed from his own pocket. Petitioner has addressed various representations, Annexures P-5 to P-7, in the year 2017 for the release of the amount and followed up with subsequent letters after his superannuation from



CWP-36990-2025

-2-

service on 31.01.2017, but payment has not been released.

3. I have heard counsel for the petitioner and considered his submissions.

4. Although, approval for the construction of Dam has been granted vide communications, Annexures P-1 to P-3, but there is no document on the record to show that petitioner was entrusted with the work of construction. There is no material to establish that work was executed and payment was ever made by the petitioner. Counsel for the petitioner has not been able to make reference to any proof to justify his claim for payment. There is no document which depicts that the respondents have admitted that amount is due to the petitioner. Furthermore, case of petitioner is that work was completed in the year 2016 and various communications were sent for release of dues in 2017 and even thereafter. Claim raised by petitioner is more than eight years old and cannot be asserted by way of a writ petition as even a civil suit for the recovery of money has become barred by time.

5. Finding no merit in the writ petition, it is dismissed with no order as to cost.

10.02.2026
Kamal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No