



CWP-25245-2025 (O&M)

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

111

CWP-25245-2025 (O&M)**Date of decision : 29.08.2025****VISHAL DEHRA****... Petitioner****Versus****FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER APPEALS PUNJAB AND OTHERS****...Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Umesh Kanwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate for the respondent No.3.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the orders dated 20.03.2025 (Annexure P-10), 14.03.2022 (Annexure P-7) and order dated 31.10.2017 (Annexure P-5) whereby the shop allotted to the petitioner has been resumed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had been allotted a Timber shop and had promptly paid 25% of the amount within the stipulated period. However, he did not make the payment of the outstanding amount as neither the site was developed nor the basic amenities were provided by the respondents.

3. Heard.

**CWP-25245-2025 (O&M)****2**

4. The petitioner had been allotted the Timber shop No.1 situated at Mandi Rajpura, District Patiala. He had deposited 25% of the total amount of Rs.93,52,000/-, within the stipulated period. In the terms and conditions of the allotment, the payment of the remaining 75%, had to be made in six equal monthly installments. The schedule of payment is set out hereunder.

Installment Rs.	Date of payment	Payable amount	Interest Rs.	Total Amount Rs.
1 st	29/03/2011	11,68,666.67	5,25,900.00	11,94,566.67
2nd	29/09/2011	11,68,666.67	4,38,250.00	16,06,916.67
3rd	29/03/2012	11,68,666.67	3,50,600.00	15,19,266.67
4th	29/09/2012	11,68,666.67	2,62,950.00	14,31,616.67
5 th	29/03/2013	11,68,666.67	1,75,300.00	13,43,966.67
6 th	29/09/2013	11,68,666.67	87,650.00	12,56,316.67

5. The petitioner did not pay any amount whatsoever, after the initial payment of 25% and failed to pay any amount towards any of the afore-noted six installments. The petitioner has alleged that the respondents did not provide the basic infrastructure but it has been noticed by the authorities in the impugned orders that the petitioner could not prove that basic infrastructure had not been provided by the respondents. The petitioner had been issued several notices including those on 30.08.2013, 27.06.2014, 07.08.2014, 08.01.2015, 30.10.2014, 13.07.2017 and 12.10.2017 for making the payment but he did not make any payment whatsoever.

6. In the afore-noted facts and circumstances, especially when the petitioner did not pay any amount after the initial deposit of 25% of the total

**CWP-25245-2025 (O&M)****3**

amount, despite issuance of several notices, we do not find any illegality in the impugned orders resuming the shop of the petitioner.

7. The petition being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

29.08.2025

Sapna

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