



CWP-17304-2018 (O & M)

-1-

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

103

**CWP-17304-2018 (O & M)
Date of Decision:12.02.2026**

SABJI MANDI, ASSOCIATION SAFIDON ...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

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

Ms. Svaneel Jaswal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Baldev Raj Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Nikita Goel, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Vishal Garg, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate
for respondents No.8 to 10.

Mr. D.D. Singla, Advocate
for respondents No.11 to 15, 19 and 20.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

CM-15347-CWP-2019

1. For the reasons given in the miscellaneous application, it is
allowed.

**CWP-17304-2018 (O & M)****-2-**

2. Legal representatives of deceased-respondent No.8 are permitted to be impleaded in place of the deceased, subject to all just exceptions.

3. Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

CWP-17304-2018

4. Grievance of the petitioner is that vegetable market, Safidon, has two approach roads from a 50 feet wide road (referred to as “Railway Road”) road leading to the railway station. Counsel for the petitioner submits that one of the roads, which is 30 feet wide, has been encroached upon by Municipal Committee, Safidon, and shops have been constructed. He has made a reference to the site plan, Annexure P-1, to assert that despite the fact that this road is being shown as a passage to the Mandi, it is not being utilized.

5. In compliance of the previous order passed by this Court, Mr. Anil Kumar Dixit, Secretary, Market Committee, Safidon, has appeared before this Court, in person. Upon instructions from him, Mr. B.R. Mahajan, learned senior counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 submits that 30 feet wide road has never been used as an access to the vegetable market. As per his instructions, approach to the vegetable market is through the 60 feet wide road and a gate has been installed on 60 feet wide road, which connects with the Railway Road. He has categorical instructions to state that no gate was ever installed on 30 feet wide road. He states that even the booth shops in the vegetable market open on the 60 feet wide road and not on the 30 feet



wide road. He has categoric instructions to state that there are shops on the Railway Road, which do not form a part of the vegetable market. Mr. Mahajan further states that 60 feet wide road is catering to the vegetable market and there is no need for any other approach to the market for the time being.

6. Mr. Ashish Kumar, Secretary, Municipal Committee, Safidon, respondent No.6, is also present, before this Court. Upon instructions from him, counsel for respondent No.6 states that 30 feet wide road was meant as an approach road to Kisan Bhawan, which was never constructed. He states that maintenance and upkeep of this road has been handed over to the Municipal Committee. He has further instructions to state that rent earned from shops constructed on the Railway Road is being utilized for the maintenance of the said area.

7. From the stand taken by respondents, it is evident that 30 feet wide road was never meant for access to vegetable market.

8. In view of the above, there is no merit in the writ petition, which is dismissed.

12.02.2026
sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No