

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

113

CWP-17734-2022

Date of Decision:24.08.2022

**Haroli Block Industries Association**

**.....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and others**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.**

**Present: Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.**

**Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.**

**Mr. R.S. Bains, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Vivek Vikas Singh, Advocate,  
for respondent Nos.6, 7, 9 and 17.**

**\*\*\*\***

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ , J.(Oral)**

Prayer in the instant civil writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for any other appropriate writ, order or direction to respondent Nos.1 to 4 to initiate immediate steps to remove illegal blockade stopping the entire vehicular traffic on the only road to Industrial Estate Haroli, Himachal Pradesh i.e. from Garhshanker to Haroli at village Mehindwani, Tehsil Garshganker, District Hoshiarpur by respondent Nos.5 to 18 and others.

Power of attorney filed on behalf of respondent Nos.6, 7, 9 and 17, is taken on record.

Vide order dated 10.08.2022, State Counsel had been asked to seek instructions from the official respondents.

On resumed hearing today, State Counsel has apprised that Mr. Shokeen, Reader to the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Garhshanker has come present and he, on instructions from the SDM, has got his statement recorded to the effect that the road blockade has already been removed and that every step shall be effectively put in place to stop any anti-social elements from carrying out road blockade leading to the Industrial Area of Haroli.

Mr. R.S. Bains, Senior Advocate, assisted by Mr. Vivek Vikas Singh, Advocate, has contended that the residents of the village had actually not set up a road blockade and were only protesting against the affluent discharge by the Industrial Units situated in the Industrial Area, Haroli.

In view of the aforesaid statement, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not press the instant writ petition.

The instant civil writ petition is dismissed, as not pressed.

Needless to reiterate that the SDM shall remain bound by the statement made on his behalf by Mr. Shokeen, Reader today present in the Court.

**August 24, 2022**  
**seema**

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No