

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

CWP-8013-2026

Date of Decision: 17.03.2026

SHIV KUMAR GOYAL

...Petitioner

Versus

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH
AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present : Mr. Vipin Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, Addl. Standing Counsel
with Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate
for the respondent-MC Chandigarh.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed, challenging the order passed by the respondent No.4-GRDRC, U.T. Chandigarh dated 27.01.2026, whereby, the petitioner's claim for continuing in the existing site, has been rejected.

2. The order impugned records that the petitioner was surveyed in Sector 22 as street vendor and was ultimately allotted the site in Vending Zone Section 15 but he has not shifted to the said site.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order of GRDRC can be challenged by filing an appeal in terms of Section 20(4) of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 but as the appellate authority has not been constituted, as such, the petitioner is being deprived of his right to file an appeal in the

matter. It is also submitted that the site, which has been allotted to the petitioner in Sector 15, is not allotted in accordance with law and therefore, the petitioner cannot be forced to shift to Sector 15.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents has placed reliance upon an order passed by this Court in ***CWP-11605-2025*** titled as ***Sahil vs Union Territory of Chandigarh and others***, decided on ***08.01.2026*** wherein, similar grievance raised by another person has been dismissed. Relying upon the judgment rendered in ***Sahil's*** case (supra), this Court dismissed the similar matter of ***Dilbagh Kumar Singla vs Union Territory of Chandigarh (CWP-16172-2025)***. The SLP filed against the said order has also been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 20.02.2026.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents points out that the allotment to petitioner in Sector 15 was made in the year 2019 and without laying any challenge to such allotment, the petitioner cannot be permitted to operate in Sector 22.

6. Though, we find that the remedy of appeal is currently not available but that would only enable the petitioner to approach this Court directly. The writ petition, therefore, is liable to be rejected.

7. In the facts of the case, we find that the petitioner, although was surveyed in Sector 22 but due to lack of available sites in such sector, the petitioner has been allotted a vending site on 06.01.2019 in Sector 15. There is no challenge laid to such allotment by the petitioner. Merely making an application stating that the creation of site is not as per law, would not be a valid ground for this Court to interfere in the matter, when the allotment

made in favour of the petitioner remains unchallenged for the last several years.

8. We have otherwise examined the facts at some length in the case of *Sahil* (supra) and it has been found that the available site in Chandigarh are far lesser than the number of candidates, who have been surveyed. It is, therefore, not possible for every person to be allocated a site of his/her liking.

9. In the present case, an alternative site has already been allotted to the petitioner on 06.01.2019, in such circumstances, we find no substance in the present petition, which accordingly fails and is dismissed.

**[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE**

March 17, 2026
gurpreet

**[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No