

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SMRITI
24/07/2019 11:40
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CWP-27492-2015

Date of Decision: July 19, 2019

Gayatri Devi

... Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and Ors

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Himanshu Dhakla, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Vashisth, Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

Mr. Kamaljeet Dahiya, Advocate, for respondent No.4

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

Grievance of the petitioner is that a road leading from Delhi Mathura Road and ending at Railway Station, Ballabhgarh is in a very bad condition with pits where there is water logging thereby causing inconvenience to the residents of the area and moreover, many accidents have occurred on the road, thus, seeking direction to maintain the said road properly.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3 submits that without going into the controversy regarding condition of the road at the time of issuance of notice, he is under instruction to submit that 42' wide road, leading from Delhi Mathura Road and ending at Railway Station, Ballabhgarh, is currently being maintained by the Municipal Corporation and is in good condition. He further submits that though at the time of issuance of notice, this Court had *prima facie* observed that the road was in pitiable condition and, therefore, the respondents were put to notice.

To buttress his submission, as noted above, that the road is in good condition, he submits that he is even willing that a Local Commissioner be appointed though at the same time, he has appended the photographs Annexures R3/1 and R3/2 which reflect that the road is indeed in good condition.

After seeing the photographs, I do not find any ground to interfere in the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court and the petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner that in case, she is still aggrieved on the condition of the road, she may approach respondent-Municipal Corporation for redressal of her grievance and if still not satisfied, she is at liberty to seek appropriate alternative remedy as may be available to her in accordance with law and if so advised.

Disposed of in above terms.

July 19, 2019
smriti

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No