



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

126

CWP-8533-2026

Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

M/S RK ENTERPRISES

...Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, AAG, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to consider its legal notice dated 09.01.2026.

2. The petitioner claims that taxi operators and transport companies engage expert persons/firms to get their vehicles registered with Licensing Authority as a number of formalities have to be completed for registration under Motor Vehicle Act, 1988. The petitioner is providing services of registration of vehicle. The respondent is not permitting it to render aforesaid services though similarly situated persons are permitted to render.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per Haryana Transport Department (Registration and Regulation of Service Providers)

Scheme, 2015, the agents are authorized to render services.



4. On being asked whether petitioner has submitted application as per 2015 Scheme, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has served legal notice upon respondents, however, application would be filed in due course.

5. Faced with this, learned State counsel submits that if petitioner files application as per 2015 Scheme, the competent authority would consider its claim and pass an appropriate order within four weeks from the date of filing application.

6. In the wake of statement of both sides, this petition stands disposed of.

7. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

20.03.2026
SDK/PRINCE

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