

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

127

**CWP-19602-2025 (O&M)****Date of decision : 31.07.2025****Shakuntla****... Petitioner****Versus****Haryana Shahri Vikas Pradhikaran and others****...Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ashna Singh, Advocate for the respondent-HSVP.

\*\*\*\*

**Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner is seeking directions to the respondents to accept the balance purchase price of the plot No.180 (4 marla category) at Sector 6, Urban Estate Rohtak, which was allotted on 22.05.2012 (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a widow with three children. Her husband had been allotted plot No.180 at Urban Estate Rohtak vide allotment letter dated 22.05.2012. The purchase price was Rs. 7,78,710/- and the husband of the petitioner had paid Rs.2,51,794/-. He could not pay the balance amount due to financial difficulty and later, he unfortunately expired on 08.11.2020 due to Covid-19. He submits that the respondents be directed to allow the petitioner to make the payment of the balance amount.

3. Issue notice to the respondents.

4. Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G. Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the allotment had been cancelled in the year

2012 itself as the petitioner could not pay the balance amount. The petitioner had sent an application on the CM window in the year 2022 where she was asked to submit the papers for consideration of her application but she had written on 06.06.2022 that she is unable to submit the required papers and therefore, her application was consigned to the record.

5. Heard.

6. The husband of the petitioner had been allotted a plot in the year 2012 but he could not pay the entire amount and the allotment had been cancelled in the year 2012 itself. The petitioner has approached this Court after a lapse of 13 years. It is indeed a hard case as the petitioner has lost her husband and is stated to be in financial difficulty. However, it is difficult for this Court to exercise writ jurisdiction after 13 years of the cancellation of the plot.

7. We do not find any illegality in the action of the respondents in cancelling the plot. The petition being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)**  
**JUDGE**

**31.07.2025**

*Sapna*

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