



111

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-15867-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.05.2026

SUNIL KUMAR

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

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

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to accept the remaining outstanding vending fee/arrears pertaining to the last installment for October, 2025 in respect of certificate of Vending (COV) No.11172/2080.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a street vendor and was unable to pay the requisite vending fee to the respondents and as per the averments made in the present petition, the petitioner has not deposited the last installment for October, 2025. He referred to the judgment passed by this Court in CWP-13287-2026, titled as Manpreet versus Union Territory, Chandigarh and others, decided on 01.05.2026, wherein in similar circumstances this Court had granted permission to the petitioner therein to



deposit the outstanding amount within a period of 15 days, subject to shifting to the authorized site because the petitioner in that case was doing business at a place where he was not authorized to do so. He also submitted that any time frame work may be fixed for the petitioner to deposit the requisite vending fee.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, learned Additional Standing Counsel, M.C., Chandigarh submitted that he has received an advance copy of the present petition and has also sought instructions. He submitted that the present petition deserves to be dismissed in view of the gross misrepresentation made in the petition. He further submitted that a perusal of the prayer clause as well as paragraph No.9 of the petition would show that the petitioner has specifically stated that he has been paying the installments but was unable to pay the installment for October 2025. He referred to Annexure P-3 and Annexure P-4, which are the receipts for the years 2018 and 2019 and submitted that in this way, in fact the petitioner has not paid the requisite fee from the year 2020 i.e. for almost six years and therefore, the case of the petitioner is not covered by the aforesaid judgment passed by this Court in **Manpreet's case (Supra)**. He further submitted that the present petition is liable to be dismissed not only on account of non-payment of the requisite fee for the last six years but also because of the misrepresentation made before this Court. He also submitted that the petitioner is doing his business at an unauthorized site in Sector 19-C, Chandigarh.

4. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

5. The grievance of the petitioner is that he was unable to pay the requisite vending fee to the respondents and was seeking some time to pay the



same because he was not able to pay the fee for the month of October, 2025. Learned counsel for the respondent-M.C., Chandigarh pointed out to the prayer clause, paragraph No.9 and Annexures P-3 and P-4 to contend that mis-statement has been made by the petitioner. It was specifically stated by the learned counsel for the respondent-M.C., Chandigarh that the petitioner has not paid the requisite fee from the year 2020. A perusal of the prayer clause of the present petition, paragraph No.9 and Annexures P-3 and P-4 would show that the receipts annexed as Annexures P-3 and P-4 pertain to the years 2018 and 2019 and therefore, are in sharp contrast to the averments made in the aforesaid paragraph. It appears that the petitioner has misled this Court by making false averments.

6. So far as the reliance made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the judgment passed by this Court in **Manpreet's case (Supra)** is concerned, the petitioner of that case was not able to pay the outstanding monthly vending fee for the last few months and this Court had granted indulgence for payment of the said amount, subject to shifting from the unauthorized site, whereas in the present case, the petitioner has not paid the requisite fee to the respondents for the last six years and therefore, clearly the case of the petitioner is not covered by the aforesaid judgment passed by this Court in **Manpreet's case (Supra)**.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the present petition deserves to be dismissed. Considering the aforesaid factual position, wherein the petitioner has misled this Court by making false averments, ordinarily this Court ought to have imposed costs upon the petitioner but considering the fact that the petitioner is



stated to be a street vendor, this Court would therefore take a liberal view and would not impose any costs.

- 8. Consequently, the present Civil Writ Petition is hereby dismissed.
- 9. Miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

26.05.2026
Chetan Thakur

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