



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

252

CWP-24253-2025

Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

M/S MEGA FURNITURE GALLERY

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Sukhjinder Singh Behl, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Raageshwari Sharma, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Arun Jindal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 30.07.2025 passed by Executive Engineer, Provisional Division, Punjab Public Works Department (B&R) whereby his legitimate claim has been arbitrarily rejected.

2. The petitioner claims that it in good faith on the asking of respondent carried out repair/renovation work of Kothi No.16 in Sector 7, Chandigarh. It incurred a sum of Rs.46.65 lakhs. The Executive Engineer PWD (B&R) vide letter dated 16.06.2023 addressed to Superintending Engineer, Chandigarh conceded work carried out by petitioner and sought *ex-post facto* sanction. The said letter was followed by letter dated 16.06.2023 of Sub Divisional Engineer addressed to Executive Engineer and letter dated 30.06.2023 authored by Superintending Engineer and addressed to Chief



Engineer. In all the letters, the authorities were conceding work carried out by petitioner and trying to get *ex-post facto* approval. The respondent by impugned order has rejected its claim on the ground that there was no formal work order to repair/furnish aforesaid house. No administrative approval is on record.

3. On being confronted with aforesaid communications, learned State counsel expressed his inability to controvert that aforesaid documents are not forged or fabricated, however, submits that formal approval was never granted, thus, State cannot make payment to petitioner.

4. From the perusal of record, it is evident that by letters dated 16.06.2023, 16.06.2023 & 30.06.2023, respondents have conceded that petitioner carried out repair/renovation work of aforesaid house. The respondent has rejected petitioner's claim on the sole ground that there was no work order. It is true that payment cannot be released without work order, however, if the petitioner has worked on the assurance of respondent that post-facto approval would be granted, it cannot be denied its payment. The respondent is bound to consider this aspect and release the payment, if during verification it is found that petitioner had actually carried out repair/renovation work.

4. In the backdrop, the petition stands disposed of. Let the needful be done within three months from today.

5. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

24.03.2026
SDK

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