



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-19530-2024((O&M)
Date of decision:-20.04.2026

Welfare Association, Sector 5, Karnal

...Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON' BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Ms. Amrita Nagpal, Advocate (THROUGH V.C.) and
Ms. Archana Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Kundra, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate
for respondents – HSVP.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing e-auction of plots bearing Nos.378-D and 378-E, Sector 5, Karnal as well as corrigendum thereto dated 23.07.2024, Annexure P12.



CWP-19530-2024(O&M)

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that Sector 5, Karnal is a densely populated area and there is a well-developed park in the centre of the sector for more than three decades. She states that this park is being maintained by the petitioner - Society, which is registered under the Haryana Registration and Regulation of Societies Act, 2012. She points out that the park has facilities for jogging and walking path, swings and a rain shelter, besides more than 100 fully grown trees. Counsel emphasizes that the salaries of the *safai karamcharis*, gardeners and other staff employed for maintaining the park are being paid by the petitioner from the funds received from the respondents. It has been asserted that residential plots bearing No.378-A onwards have been carved out from the park and are being put to auction through the impugned advertisement and corrigendum for commercial use. Counsel has made a detailed reference to the layout plan of the sector.

3. Upon notice, writ petition has been contested by the respondents by filing a short response. It has been contended that the area in front of certain plots was kept reserved as incidental green/open space due to a 27 meter wide buffer zone/requisite right of way of 132 KV HT line and no park was earmarked in the layout plan, as alleged by the petitioner. It has been categorically stated that after exhaustive exercise of review of planning of Karnal Urban Estate, it was found that the KV lines were affecting large parcels of land in Sectors 5 to 9, Karnal. After examining the matter, it was decided by the competent authority to shift the KV lines from their location to recover the land.



The layout plan was revised, which was approved by the Chief Administrator, HSVP and conveyed vide memo dated 16.11.2022. Some plots in different categories were carved out. Lay out plan was circulated vide memo dated 23.11.2022 by the District Town Planner. It has been specifically stated that the work of shifting of 132 KV HT lines was awarded to a private concern on 25.04.2022 and the work has since been completed. Respondents have stated that plots No.378-D and 378-E, Sector 5, Karnal have been sold in auction on 24.07.2024 and Letter of Intent is in the process of being issued.

4. Having heard counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that petitioner has not been able to establish that space in the middle of Sector 5, Karnal was earmarked as a green or open space in the layout plan. It is clear that this area was kept vacant because no construction was allowed under the overhanging 132 KV HT lines and after their removal, respondents decided to carve out plots which have been auctioned. Revised layout drawings were approved and have been circulated. A categorical statement has been made by the respondents that the total permitted salable area in Sector 5 is 55% and even after carving of the new plots, the total saleable area is about 51%, which is within the laid down norms. As per the respondents, four parks have been carved out in the layout plan of Sector 5, Karnal, which are available for use of residents.

5. In view of the stand taken by the respondents, which has not been controverted by the petitioner, this Court does not find any ground



to interfere with the decision to carve out plots and to auction them.

6. Petition being bereft of merit, is dismissed with no order as to costs.

7. Pending miscellaneous application (s) stand disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

20.04.2026
Brij

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

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