



CWP-31990-2019

-1-

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

214

CWP-31990-2019

Date of decision: 11.09.2024

Naib Singh & ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

Union of India & ors.

...Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Shubham Pabbi, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pankaj Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Munish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana
for respondents No.2 to 4, 9, 11 and 12

Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate
for respondents No.5 and 6.

Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. P.S. Chauhan, Advocate
for respondents No.7 and 8.

Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Abishai Alfred George, Advocate
for respondent No.10.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for issuing directions to the respondents to prohibit unlawful activities of tractor trolley owners who are plying their vehicles for commercial purposes without having requisite permit under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that this Court in different writ petitions including CWPs No.1797 of 1987, 13974 of 1995, 12225 of 2000, 6526 of 2011 and 20174 of 2012 has already issued directions with regards to tractors trolley plied illegally for commercial

**CWP-31990-2019**

purposes and without having requisite permits. He contends that one of such orders relates to the illegal or unauthorized use of tractor trolleys for commercial purposes pertaining to Yamunanagar itself, for which such cause this writ petition has also been filed.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the opinion that once the aspect has already been considered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court and directions have already been issued to the respondents, a separate writ petition for issuance of similar direction or for implementation of the directions already given is accordingly not maintainable.

I find that the said grievance can be espoused before the Bench, which deals with the contempts/non-compliance of orders passed or the petitioners may, if so advised, seek a revival of the writ petition where the matter was initially decided.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he does not want to press this petition so as to file appropriate petition/application, if so advised.

Disposed of as not pressed at this stage with the liberty as aforesaid.

11.09.2024
monika

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No