



CWP-22926-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

(108)

CWP-22926-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision:- 13.08.2025

M/s Krishna Enterprises through its proprietors

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Pankaj Mehta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

CM-11642-CWP-2025

1. Application is allowed, as prayed for.
2. Re-allotment letter dated 12.03.2025, is taken on record as Annexure P-8.

CWP-22926-2025

3. Present petition has been filed *inter alia* for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to restore petitioner's firm by allotting the same area of operation as was allotted before termination of the distribution agency.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was granted distributorship for supply of Vita products vide letter dated 19.05.2008, but without assigning any reason, vide letter dated 13.05.2011, distributorship was



cancelled. Counsel states that termination was challenged before this Court and by order dated 08.01.2016, Annexure P-1, cancellation letter was set aside. Counsel states that petitioner filed a contempt petition, which was disposed of on 17.03.2025, and vide re-allotment letter dated 12.03.2025, Annexure P-8, petitioner has been allotted untapped area located in the outskirts of northern Faridabad, whereas earlier petitioner was allotted distributorship for area marked as A and B in the site plan, Annexure P-3, which had a very high demand for Vita products. Counsel states that petitioner has submitted representations, Annexures P-5 and P-6, to respondent No.3, for allotment of the earlier area, which are pending. Counsel asserts that petitioner has been discriminated against to protect the interest of Mr. Manbir Bhatti, ex-Sales Manager of the respondents, as the said area has been allotted in the name of his close relative.

5. Having heard counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the view that there is no merit in the writ petition. While accepting the writ petition vide order dated 08.01.2016, Annexure P-1, this Court observed as under:-

“For the reasons mentioned above, the impugned order dated 13.05.2011 (Annexure P-3) cancelling the distribution of the petitioner cannot be legally sustained. Hence, the same is set aside.

The petition is allowed.”

6. LPAs preferred by the respondents against this order, were dismissed. It is evident from the perusal of the above order that after setting aside the cancellation, this Court did not direct the respondent, to re-allot the earlier area to the petitioner. In the absence of any direction, petitioner cannot claim that he



is entitled to re-allotment of the same area. Allegation levelled by him against a former employee of the respondents is without any basis. Petitioner has neither annexed the allotment letter in favour of Mr. Manbir Bhatti’s relative, nor has he impleaded the said allottee as a party to the writ petition. Bald allegation levelled without any material deserves to be simply rejected. There is no vested right of the petitioner to claim that he should be given a particular area for distribution of Vita products, which has more business potential. There is no substance in the claim raised by the petitioner.

7. Finding no merit, writ petition is dismissed with no order as to cost.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

13.08.2025
Pardeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes