



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

CWP-29097-2025

Date of Decision : 26.09.2025

Rahul Singla

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr.Vivek Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. D.V.Sharma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Shivani Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 19.06.2025 whereby his application for consideration of his case under the 'One Time Relaxation Policy' dated 16.04.2025 has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that father of the petitioner had been allotted a plot in the year 1980. The father of the petitioner was killed by the terrorists in the year 1991 and a conveyance deed was executed in favour of the legal heirs in the year 1998. The petitioner had paid the non-construction charges up to year 2009. However, later due to the ill health of his mother, he could not pay the same and allotment of the plot was cancelled on 04.09.2017. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is ready

to pay the restoration and non-construction charges as assessed by the respondents when his plot was restored on 04.06.2021 along with interest till date.

3. Heard.

4. The father of the petitioner is stated to have been allotted 275 square yards plot on 23.07.1980, but unfortunately he was killed by the terrorists on 23.07.1991. The conveyance deed was executed on 29.12.1998 in favour of the legal heirs of the deceased including the petitioner. The non-construction charges are stated to have been paid only till 30.06.2009 and thereafter on account of non-payment of non-construction charges, the plot was resumed vide order dated 04.09.2017. The petitioner had preferred an appeal thereagainst and plot was restored on 04.06.2021 and a demand of Rs.7,18,714/- on account of restoration and non-construction charges was raised. The petitioner deposited only a sum of Rs.44,690/-, which was not accepted by the respondents. He again preferred an application for restoration of the plot on 18.07.2023, but the same was rejected by the respondents. Later, the State Government had issued a notification on 16.04.2025 introducing a 'One Time Relaxation Policy' for waiver of non-construction charges. The petitioner had applied thereunder on 13.06.2025, but his case had been rejected on 19.06.2025 for the reason that the policy did not apply to those cases where the plots have been cancelled.

5. It is, thus, patent that the case of the petitioner is not covered under the policy as the allotment stood cancelled prior to the notification of the 'One Time Relaxation Policy' dated 16.04.2025. The petitioner had also defaulted in making the payment towards restoration and non-construction

charges although he had been afforded an opportunity to do so in the year 2021.

6. In view of the above, we do not find any illegality in the impugned order declining the request of the petitioner for restoration of the plot. The petition stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE**

26.09.2025

vanita

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