

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****118****CWP-25383-2025****DATE OF DECISION: 29.08.2025****SUNDER LAL SHARMA**

... Petitioner (s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

... Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate
Mr. Saurav Tyagi, Advocate for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 27.02.2024 (Annexure P-12) whereby his request for allotment of an alternate plot has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied for allotment of a plot measuring 180 square metres in the Urban Estate, Rewari and was found successful in the draw of lots. The allotment letter was issued to him with regard to plot No.785-GP measuring 180 square metres on 27.12.2010 (Annexure P-1). However, the respondents later offered a plot of 121.08 square meters which is unjustified. The petitioner ought to have been allotted a plot of 180 square metres.

3. Heard.

4. The petitioner had initially indeed been allotted a plot of 180 square meters plot and the allotment letter was issued in that regard on 27.12.2010. The respondents are stated to have offered him an alternate plot as while replanning, when it was found after demarcation that the actual area was less than the earlier projected area, the petitioner was informed about the same and he had accepted the allotment of the plot measuring 121.08 square meters. He

had been refunded the excess amount paid by him and that also was accepted by the petitioner on 13.09.2023.

5. The petitioner having accepted the re-allotment of a 121.08 square meters plot and having taken possession of the same without any demur, cannot later turn around and seek allotment of a larger size plot.

6. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents have not paid interest for the delay in possession, as well as on the amount which they had refunded to the petitioner after significant period of time.

7. We do not find any illegality in the impugned order rejecting the representation of the petitioner for allotment of an alternate plot. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to file a representation to the respondents with regard to the refund as well as interest payable thereon and other grievance, if any. In the event of the petitioner preferring an application to the respondents, respondent No.4 shall consider and decide the same in accordance with their Policy within a period of two months from its receipt.

8. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

29.08.2025

SwarnjitS

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