

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

WP(C) No. 2491/2026

Chaman Lal and others

.....Appellant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Sandeep Singh, Advocate

vs

UT of J&K and others

..... Respondent(s)

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Salathia, Dy. AG for R-1 & 2.
Ms. Nazia Fazal, Advocate vice
Mrs. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG for R-3

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE

ORDER

11.08.2026

1. The petitioners claim to have voluntarily donated their land situated at Village Ransoo, which serves as the base camp for the Holy Shrine of Shiv Khori, for the establishment of a Bus Stand. It is their case that, in consideration of the said donation, they were granted route permits in the year 2022 for plying E-Autos on the route from Bus Stand, Ransoo to Taxi Stand, Ransoo and vice versa.
2. The grievance projected by the petitioners is that the respondents have now initiated the process of introducing E-Autorickshaws with a view to reducing environmental pollution. It is stated that, under the policy adopted by the respondents, no route permit is required for plying such E-Autos. Consequently, the respondents have permitted the operation of E-Autos from Bus Stand, Ransoo, instead of Taxi Stand, Ransoo, which, according to the petitioners, is causing them financial loss and considerable hardship.

3. It is further contended that the route permits granted in favour of the petitioners prescribe specific routes for operation, whereas no such route-specific restriction is applicable to the E-Autos. The petitioners, therefore, apprehend that the E-Autos may operate without any defined route restrictions, thereby adversely affecting their rights and livelihood. The petitioners further submit that they have already approached the respondents by way of a representation, pointing out that they had donated their land for the construction of the Bus Stand and were granted route permits in consideration thereof. On this basis, they requested the respondents to reconsider the decision permitting the plying of E-Autos from Taxi Stand, Ransoo to Darshani Deodi.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the operation of E-Autos has been considered necessary and that such vehicles are permitted to operate only beyond a distance of two kilometres and from a designated stand. It is, accordingly, submitted that their operation neither infringes upon the rights of the petitioners nor causes any hardship to them.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the grievance of the petitioners would stand adequately redressed if the respondents are directed to consider their case in the light of the averments made in the writ petition. Learned counsel for the respondents raises no objection to the said course being adopted.
6. In view of the aforesaid submissions and having regard to the nature of the controversy involved, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to treat the writ petition as a representation on behalf of the petitioners and to consider and decide the same in accordance

with the applicable policy and law. Before taking a decision, the respondents shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners as well as all other interested/affected persons. The representation shall thereafter be disposed of by a reasoned order, as expeditiously as possible.

7. The writ petition stands *disposed of* in the aforesaid terms.

(Sanjay Parihar)
Judge

Jammu
11.08.2026
Rahul Sharma

