

CM-75-CWPIL-2026 in/and CWP-PIL-228-2024 (O&M)

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

VS.

UT CHANDIGARH THROUGH ADVISOR TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

(Through Video Conference/Hybrid Mode)

Present: Mr. R.S. Bains, Senior Advocate, assisted by
(appeared through VC)
Mr. Utsav Singh Bains, Advocate,
for applicant (Proposed Intervener).

Mr. Abhinav Sood, Addl. Standing Counsel, with
Mr. Sayyam Garg, Advocate.

Ms. Samdisha Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

CM-75-CWPIL-2026

1. This application is filed by the applicant-Kulwant Singh seeking his impleadment as an Intervener as well as seeking impleadment of Tej Parkash Singh, son of Late Sh. Beant Singh, (ex-Chief Minister) as respondent No.4 in the present PIL petition being a necessary party, stating that the House No.3/33, Sector-5, Chandigarh was originally allotted to Late Sh. Beant Singh, which has been retained by his family members against the spirit of the order dated 07.05.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 864 of 2016.

2. An affidavit has been filed by the Chandigarh Administration pointing out that Late Sh. Beant Singh was done to death in an act of

terrorism and that his family members continued to face security threats.

3. An affidavit dated 06.10.2026 has been produced by the Addl. Standing Counsel, U.T., Chandigarh today in the Court. The same is taken on record. In the said affidavit, it is clarified that the House Allotment Committee, Chandigarh Administration has considered the continuance of the occupancy of the said house in respect of Tej Parkash Singh, and the same is dealt with in Paras 12 and 13 of the letter dated 01.06.2026, which are reproduced hereinafter:-

***“12.** The Committee further noted that the protectees, being family members of late Sardar Beant Singh, continue to remain vulnerable targets of Babbar Khalsa International (BKI, Khalistani radical elements, gangsters and Pakistan-backed anti-national outfits.*

The report also took serious note of:

- I. Recent grenade attacks and terror-related incidents in Chandigarh and the Punjab region;*
- II. Revival of extremist and radical organisations;*
- III. Persistent threat calls and hostile social media campaigns;*
- IV. Intelligence inputs received from central and state agencies indicating continuing hostile intent against the protectees; and*
- V. Operational vulnerability that may arise in the event of relocation from the present premises.*

***13.** The Joint Security Committee has further recommended that House No. 3/33, Sector-5, Chandigarh is strategically suitable and security-wise appropriate for the residence of the protectees. The Committee also*

observed that the existing security deployment and infrastructure at the premises are satisfactory, while recommending the installation of additional CCTV cameras and strengthening of surveillance arrangements.”

4. The directions issued by the Hon’ble Supreme Court were intended to ensure that Government servants do not continue to occupy Government accommodation beyond their retirement etc. Such general directions cannot, however, be relied upon by the applicant to contend that Tej Parkash Singh cannot be allowed to continue in the accommodation in question, particularly when the U.T., Chandigarh Administration, upon consideration of the threat perception and the inputs received from the intelligence agencies, has taken a conscious decision that his continued occupation of the Government accommodation is warranted.

5. It is not in dispute that, pursuant to the directions issued by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, the Chandigarh Administration had initially cancelled the allotment. However, upon receipt of a representation from the occupant and after considering the inputs received from the intelligence agencies, the competent authority reconsidered the matter and arrived at a different conclusion. In these circumstances, we find no merit in the application seeking enforcement of the earlier decision of the U.T., Chandigarh Administration cancelling the allotment of the house in question. This being a case of its own kind, and clearly

distinguishable, would not fall within clutches of the directions issued by the apex Court, therefore, the application for intervention, moved by the applicant, questioning the continuance of the said house, is hereby rejected.

CWP-PIL-228-2024 (O&M)

In the facts of the case, we call upon the Chief Engineer, U.T., Administration to file his personal affidavit clearly explaining as to why requisite repairs have not been carried out in the Government houses allotted to the employees of the High Court.

It goes without saying that necessary repairs of the house allotted to the High Court employees would be got undertaken on priority basis and be intimated to the Court forthwith.

Adjourned to **26.11.2026.**

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
CHIEF JUSTICE

October 6, 2026
Ess Kay

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE