

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

202

2025:PHHC:167591-DB



**CWP No. 27218 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 2nd December, 2025**

Gurdeep Singh Dhillon

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. Nikhil Sheoran, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J(Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the validity of notification dated 06.10.1998 by which, the Punjab Control of Bricks Supplies Price and Distribution Control Order, 1998, (for short '1998 order') has been issued and further challenge is to the clause 3 of 1998 order and order dated 04.10.2017 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.4 by which application moved by appellant for grant of license for trading of bricks has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that in order to sell the bricks or store or manufacture the same, a license is needed to do the same as per Clause-4 of 1998 order and the petitioner who used to sell the bricks earlier, is not entitled to sell the bricks any more and therefore unreasonable restriction has been imposed upon the petitioner qua the selling of the bricks, which is incorrect.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and has gone through the record with his able assistance.

4. It may be noted that the definition of 'dealer' has been mentioned in Clause-2, Sub Clause (c) of 1998 order, and as per said clause, though right has been given to the dealer to manufacture and sell bricks but the bricks can be sold at the kiln to a trader who can further sell it, hence, it is incorrect that the petitioner cannot carry on the business as, he by way of dealing with the dealer of brick kiln owner, who has a license to manufacture the same, the petitioner can sell the bricks.

5. Further merely that some difficulties arise for a particular person qua the reasonable restriction imposed to him/her qua selling/supplying or controlling price of the bricks, the same cannot be treated as a valid ground to set aside an order passed which is in favour of the general public who are the ultimate consumer of the bricks.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show that any regulation has been violated or that any right guaranteed to petitioner under the Constitution has been violated qua the passing of the 1988 order or same is ultra-virus.

7. No ground is made out for any interference.

8. Dismissed.

9. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

2nd December, 2025

reema

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No