



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

Date of Decision : 08.04.2026

1. CWP-5975-2025 (O&M)

**STAGE CARRIAGE PRIVATE BUS OPERATORS WELFARE
ASSOCIATION REGD. HARYANA AND OTHERS**

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent

2. CWP-7330-2025 (O&M)

KULDEEP

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent

3. CWP-6259-2025 (O&M)

**THE GURUNANAK COOPERTIVE TPT SOCIETY LIMITED AND
OTHERS**

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Amjit Jhanji Senior Advocate with
Ms. Nikita Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No.5975 of 2025.

Mr. D.S Patwalia, Senior Advocate with
Mr. A.S Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No.7330 of 2025.

Mr. H.S Jalal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No.6259 of 2025.

Mr. Sandeep Chhabra, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. Present are the bunch of three petitions, the details of which are mentioned in the heading, involving common question of law in the context of common set of facts and thus they are being decided by a common order.
2. The prayer in the petitions is for setting aside the impugned notification under Section 102(1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 dated 07.03.2024 (Annexure P/22), coupled with the notification dated 08.07.2024 (Annexure P/24), to the effect that Clause VI of the modified Policy Notification dated 07.03.2024 envisages that minimum permits, demanded permits and maximum permits to be issued on each route are to be notified in the Official Gazette, it also envisages that such notification is to be issued only after approval of the State Government and is to be brought into operation before granting any letter of intent or permit is issued on such route.
3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that they would be satisfied in case Clause VI of the modified Policy Notification dated 07.03.2024 issued by the respondent-State is complied with by the respondent-State in true letter and spirit before the notification of modification dated 07.03.2024 is made operational for seeking applications for the grant of permits on the routes mentioned therein.
4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that an affidavit had already been filed by the respondent-State a year ago stating that the said aspect was under consideration and would be finalized however, the same has not been finalized except for indicating the minimum permits which can be issued on each route, which is the basic requirement as per Clause VI of the modified Policy Notification dated 07.03.2024.

Subsequently, by Notification dated 08.07.2024, the minimum permits to be allotted on each route were defined.

5. Learned State Counsel was asked as to within what time the maximum number of permits to be issued on each route would be notified so as to implement the policy for the grant of permits, as the said policy has not been finalized despite the lapse of more than nine years since the issuance of the last policy in the year 2017, which was withdrawn.

6. Learned State Counsel, on instructions from Mr. Atul Kumar Dwivedi, Transport Commissioner, Haryana, who is present in Court, submits that the necessary requirements, keeping in view the prescription of minimum and maximum permits to be issued on each route, shall be complied with by issuance of a relevant notification within a period of ***four months*** from today. All requirements to be adhered under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 for implementing the scheme for issuance of permits shall also be complied with so that there is no further ambiguity or discrepancy in issuing advertisements for seeking application for the grant of permits on the routes notified by the Government keeping in view the modified Policy Notification dated 07.03.2024, as has been amended notification on 08.07.2024.

7. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that, in view of the statement given by the learned State Counsel, no further grievance of the petitioner(s) survives, and the present petitions may kindly be disposed of as not pressed any further, with liberty to the petitioner(s) to avail appropriate remedy in case the statement recorded hereinbefore is not implemented in true letter and spirit.

8. It may be noticed that, rather than adjudicating upon the demanded permits by concerned in order to finalize the maximum number of permits to be granted, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to issue a notification describing the maximum permits to be issued on each route, keeping in view past practice and any survey conducted by it to form an opinion for issuing such notification. Further, in case the respondent-State is of the view that the clause requiring assessment of the demanded permits is not necessary, it shall be within its jurisdiction to withdraw the said requirement from the notification in order to define the minimum or maximum number of permits to be granted, to be notified in terms of the undertaking recorded hereinbefore.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

08-04-2026
Sapna Goyal

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/ reasoned: YES
Whether reportable: NO