

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S). _____ OF 2026
(@SLP (CIVIL) NO(S). _____ OF 2026)
(@ SLP (CIVIL) DIARY NO(S).16360 OF 2026

HARYANA SHEHRI VIKAS PRADHIKARAN & ANR. APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

ALCHEMIST HOSPITAL & ORS. RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. Heard.

2. Delay condoned.

3. Leave granted.

4. The present appeal(s) arises out of the judgment dated 12.03.2025 passed in CWP No.26692/2021 and review order dated 05.02.2026 passed in RA-CW-18/2026 whereby jurisdictional High Court upheld the revised layout plan of e-auction process relating to auction of nursing home sites in Sector 21, Panchkula and simultaneously directed the appellant(s) herein to issue an allotment letter and execute the conveyance deed in favour of Respondent No.1. The dispute originated when the appellant(s) conducting an e-auction of nursing home sites Nos.1, 2 and 3 situated in front of House No.1957, Sector 21, Panchkula.

5. Respondent Nos.2 to 24 challenged the revised layout plan dated 25.10.2021 and sought to restraining the auction proceedings and Respondent No.1 claimed entitlement for allotment of the site which was auctioned being the successful Bidder. According to the appellant herein, though High Court upheld the validity of the revised layout plan and the auction process, it committed an error by directing issuance of an allotment letter and execution of the conveyance deed in favour of Respondent No.1 herein, despite the factual and legal impediments pointed out by the appellants. Hence, for modifying the said order or setting aside the said direction, the present appeal(s) has been filed.

6. We have heard the learned senior counsels appearing for the parties and have bestowed our careful and anxious considerations to the rival contentions raised at the Bar. It is the contention of the appellant that consequential directions regarding allotment and execution of the conveyance deed is contrary to the material on record and said direction could not have been issued after upholding the revised layout plan and also the auction process. It is contended that High Court exceeded the scope of the writ proceedings in granting such a relief. Per contra, the learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No.1 would support the said direction issued by the High Court by placing heavy reliance on the grounds urged in the review petition itself whereunder the appellant(s) herein had not only defended the e-auction process conducted but also Respondent No.1 having been declared as the successful highest Bidder and as such the necessary corollary was appellant-authority had to only issue the allotment letter and conveyance deed and it is for this precise reason, a writ of mandamus has been issued to the authorities and defending the same he prays for dismissal of the appeal(s).

7. As noticed hereinabove, at the time of entertaining the writ petition the High Court had granted the stay of further proceedings pursuant to the e-auction conducted by the appellant(s). After having upheld the revised layout plan as well as the auction process conducted by the appellant(s) herein, the High Court

ought to have restricted to that extent only. The High Court committed a serious error in issuing Mandamus to the appellant(s) herein to issue the allotment letter and the conveyance deed. As a consequence of dismissal of the writ petition by upholding the revised layout plan, the necessary steps that ought to have followed, would have automatically followed and as such without expressing any opinion on the contentions with regard to the rights of Respondent No.1 to claim issuance of allotment letter and conveyance deed or the right of the appellant(s) to either issue the letter of intent/conveyance deed or cancel the e-auction process and leaving all such contentions open, we modify the High Court order only to the extent of the directions that have been issued to the appellant(s) to issue LOI/allotment letter/conveyance deed in favour of Respondent No.1 as not warranted and setting aside the same and maintaining the order of the High Court to the extent of dismissal of the writ petition and upholding the revised plan and e-auction process, we allow this appeal(s) in part to the extent aforestated above. No orders as to costs.

8. All pending application(s) stands consigned to records.

.....J.
(ARAVIND KUMAR)

.....J.
(VIPUL M. PANCHOLI)

**New Delhi;
August 10, 2026.**

ITEM NO.29

COURT NO.11

SECTION IV-B

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 16360/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05-02-2026 in RACW No. 18/2026 12-03-2025 in CWP No. 26692/2021 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

HARYANA SHEHRI VIKAS PRADHIKARAN & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ALCHEMIST HOSPITAL & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 195538/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

IA No. 195541/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS

IA No. 195537/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 10-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARAVIND KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Vikramjit Banerjee, A.S.G.
Mr. Varun Chugh, Adv.
Ms. Shagun Chugh, Adv.
Ms. Aishwarya Jaiswal, Adv.
Ms. Khyati Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Tanya Chhattni, Adv.
Mr. Sahil Bhalotia, Adv.
Mr. Kabir Singh, Adv.
Mr. Prashant Rawat, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Puneet Bali, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sumeet Lall, AOR
Mr. Aditya Soni, Adv.
Mr. Gunjan Rishi, Adv.
Mr. Sidhant Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Rishi, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Delay condoned.

Leave granted.

The appeal(s) is allowed in part in terms of the Signed Order which is placed on the file.

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

(RASHI GUPTA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(AVGV RAMU)
COURT MASTER (NSH)