



211 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

LPA-270-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 28-01-2026

UJJWALA LATHER

.....Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. Amit Jain, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Chetan Slathia, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Sandeep Chhabra, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate
and Mr. M.S Rana, Advocate
for the respondents No.5 and 6.

Mr. Shubhkarman Singh Gill, Advocate
for Mr. Balwinder Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.9.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. On 08.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents at the outset submits that though, there is a challenge to the order passed by the learned Single Judge rejecting the plea raised at the hands of the appellant with regard to violation of the guidelines dated 15.07.2024 (Annexure P-2) pertaining to statutory rules that distance between two fuel stations on highways should not be less than 5 K.Ms and the petrol pump allotted to respondent No.9 is just abutting petrol pump of appellant thus, the order is patently illegal but, subsequent to the present order, another challenge at the hands of the appellant qua similar grievance has been passed and it has

*been held while deciding CWP No.20197 of 2014 decided on 24.01.2024 titled as **Ujjwala Lather Vs. Indian Oil Corporation and others**” that rival trader cannot challenge grant of NOC to another person under the guise of alleged violations of guidelines or statutory rules, solely to inhibit competition which judgment has not been challenged by the appellant. Hence, once, the same question of law has been accepted by the appellant, the challenge to the same question in the present petition is liable to be rejected.*

Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant seeks a day’s adjournment to find out the decision in CWP No.20197 of 2014 decided on 24.01.2024.

Adjourned to 10.12.2025.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant has not been able to rebut the facts mentioned therein to contend that similar issue raised by the petitioner in CWP No.20197 of 2014, was ultimately decided and no appeal was preferred.

3. Keeping in view the facts that once, a similar issue has already been decided while passing the order in CWP No.20197 of 2014 dated 24.01.2024, the present petition is also disposed of in the same terms.

4. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

28-01-2026
Sapna Goyal

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES
Whether reportable: NO