



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

**CWP-37178-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:02.02.2026**

SANJAY BALUJA

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Abhishek Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. A. K. Goyal, Addl., AG, Punjab.
Ms. Avin Sandhu, Advocate for respondent No.2-GMADA.
Ms. Anu Chatrath, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Yuvraj Dhananjaya, Advocate for respondent No.3-
M.C., Mohali.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. The grievance of the petitioner is that, although he had valid authority to put up a vending stall under the provisions of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014, the authorities, on a misconstruction of the applicable provisions, demolished the petitioner's vending stall. Accordingly, a prayer has been made to direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to re-erect his stall at the cost of the respondents.

2. While entertaining the writ petition, time was granted to the respondents to obtain instructions and to file a reply.

3. A reply has been filed by respondent No.3-M.C. Mohali, wherein it is stated that the Certificate of Vending issued to the petitioner was for mobile vending and did not permit him to undertake stationary vending by putting up a stall.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance upon

Annexure P-2 appended with the writ petition, which is stated to be the I.D. card issued to the petitioner, wherein the place of vending is mentioned as *Phase-11, Bulk Market, Mohali*.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and have perused the material annexed with the instant writ petition.

6. It is undisputed that the Certificate of Vending issued to the petitioner specifies the category of vending as ‘mobile’ and not ‘stationary’. Even Annexure P-2 only indicates the area of vending as Phase-11, Bulk Market, Mohali, which would be the area within which such mobile vending activity can be undertaken by the petitioner.

7. The respondents have also placed material on record to show that the area has otherwise been declared as a ‘no-vending zone’.

8. Once that be so, the action of the respondents in removing the petitioner’s vending stall put up on the public footpath does not warrant any interference.

9. In view of the above, the instant writ petition is dismissed.

10. The dismissal of the writ petition shall, however, not preclude the petitioner from working as a mobile vendor in the area assigned to him.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 02, 2026
Rahul Joshi

1. Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
2. Whether Reportable	Yes/No