



CWP-20008-2025

-1-

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

108

CWP-20008-2025

Date of decision : 18.07.2025

Vinod

... Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory of Chandigarh and others

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjeev Ghai, Advocate for the respondent-UT, Chandigarh.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 15.01.2019 (Annexure P-3) whereby he had been re-located to another vending site.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was earlier working as a street vender in Sector 19, Chandigarh and arbitrarily, he had been asked to shift to another vending site. He also submits that he was not issued any notice prior to re-location of the vending site.

3. Mr. Sanjeev Ghai, Advocate, who appeared on advance notice on behalf of the respondent/UT, Chandigarh, submits that the petitioner had been allotted an alternative vending site in Sector 15 in the year 2019 vide the impugned order (Annexure P-3).

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, we are of the considered view that this petition has been filed after 06 years of passing of the

**CWP-20008-2025****-2-**

impugned order (Annexure P-3). There is no explanation whatsoever for the huge delay in preferring the writ petition. By the impugned order (Annexure P-3), the petitioner has been allotted an alternative vending site bearing No.648, Sector 15, Chandigarh, therefore, we do not find any illegality in the order of allotment.

5. Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

July 18, 2025
sonia gugnani

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