



CWP-19317-2025 1

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

211

CWP-19317-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.01.2026

Bishamber Lal Ahuja

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory of Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**

Present: Mr. Himanshu Trehan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, Advocate
for respondent(s)-Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed assailing an order dated 08.04.2025 passed by the Grievance Redressal and Disputes Resolution Committee constituted under the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014. The Forum in its order has recorded as under:-

“The vending site has been allotted to him through draw of lots. The request of the applicant for grant of permission to work at the surveyed site e. Sector 19/C, Chandigarh, which is not possible as the limited number of vending sites have been allotted by the Chief Architect, Chandigarh Administration in sector 19/C, Chandigarh which was duly approved by the then His Excellency Administrator, Chandigarh Administrator. Further there is no provision in the Act, Rules, Scheme and Bye Laws to relocate the vendor on his surveyed site. Moreover, the allocation process is fair and transparent. There are no irregularities or disputes in the draw of lots at that time. Therefore, the request of the applicant cannot be considered as the vending site is already allotted to him through draw of lots.”

It transpires that even the allotted site in Sector 46 has also been

**CWP-19317-2025 2**

cancelled. The petitioner was working in Sector 19-C. In the draw of lots, he has been given in site Sector-46. This was in the year 2019. The respondent has categorically stated that the available sites in Sector 19-C have been allotted to other persons and no vacant site is available. Only 32 sites were available in the Sector, which have been allotted to other persons. It is also the case of the respondents that no vacant site in Sector 19-C is otherwise available. Considering the fact that the number of persons seeking allotments is far more than the available sites, the respondents have resorted to a draw of lots pursuant to which an alternative site has been given to the petitioner. It is also the case of the respondents that the place where the petitioner was working was not part of the approved vending zone of Sector 19.

3. We find no ground to interfere with the allotment of an alternative site to the petitioner. The contention that Sector 46 is not developed cannot be countenanced, in as much as, in the absence of availability of vending sites in Sector 19-C, the petitioner cannot be allowed to continue there.

4. At this stage, we are also informed that, for non-payment of dues, even the allotted site in Sector 46 has been cancelled.

5. This Court need not express any opinion on this aspect of the matter, as the petitioner claims that an appeal has been filed and that the remedies under the Act have not been exhausted, so far.

6. It transpires that in the appeal filed by the petitioner challenging cancellation of allotment a conditional order was passed which has not been complied with. Be that as it may, those aspects are not under challenge before us and, therefore, we refrain from expressing any opinion in that



CWP-19317-2025 3

2014.

- 7. We accordingly do not find any occasion to interfere in the matter and the writ petition is hereby dismissed.
- 8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

12.01.2026
Rajeev (rvs)

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

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