

2025:PHHC:082915



153

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

**CWP-16105-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.07.2025**

M/s Garg Construction Company Through Its Partner

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate and
Mr. Eashan Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Bhatia, Senior Standing Counsel
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Vikram Preet Arora, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Maninder Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Yugank Goyal, Advocate for
Mrs. Avin Kaur Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Harpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

Petition herein is, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus against the inaction of official respondents No.3 to 5 in securing the execution of work allotted to the petitioner, vide Contract Agreement dated 27.10.2024 (Annexure P-1), granted by respondents No.1 and 2 for placing commercial advertisement rights through

Hoarding LC Gates for 29 sites and 24 locations within District Mohali.

2. It is the case of petitioner that the hoardings/advertisements installed by it have been demolished and vandalized by the office(s) of respondents No.3 and 4.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 has filed a short reply by way of affidavit dated 04.07.2025 of Mr. Parminder Pal Singh, I.A.S., Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. A copy thereof is also handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner, in Court today itself. Relevant extract of the said reply reads as under:-

“2. That the deponent has gone through the contents of the writ petition and is competent to file the present reply on behalf of Respondent No.3.

3. That the contents of the writ petition, as alleged against this answering Respondent, are misconceived, factually incorrect and not maintainable in law.

4. That the Petitioner has sought relief against Respondent Nos.3 and 4 on the basis of a contract granted by the Railway Authorities (Respondents No.1 and 2).

5. That the Municipal Corporation, SAS Nagar, has already communicated its stand to the Petitioner vide letter No.1119 dated 07.05.2025, wherein it was clearly stated that since the advertisement sites installed by the petitioner are not in the jurisdiction of the Municipal Corporation SAS Nagar, Mohali, concerns therefore, the N.O.C. cannot be issued by the office of the answering respondent.

6. That as per Clause 8.1.1(VI), 8.1.3 and 8.1.5 of the Punjab Municipal Outdoor Advertisement Policy, 2018 and Clause 11.1.3 of the Punjab Municipal Outdoor Advertisement Byelaws, 2018, advertisements on Railway Bridges are categorized as “Not Permitted” due to public safety.

7. That it is pertinent to mention here that the petitioner has

not installed the advertisements on the site allotted by the respondent No.2 and rather has installed the advertisement at the road which is near about 50 meters away from the jurisdiction of respondent No.3 and which is within the jurisdiction of respondent No.4.

8. That the petitioner submitted another representation dated Nil which is annexed herewith this petition as Annexure P/8 with the office of the answering respondent on 05.06.2025 and in reply to the said representation the petitioner was requested to provide the RFP, E-tender/E-auction document/Notification, work order and agreement executed between the petitioner company and Ministry of railways vide letter bearing 1479/Advt/2025 dated 24.06.2025 but the petitioner failed to submit the record before the office of the answering respondent. Hence the respondent could not decide his petition.

9. That the respondent Municipal Corporation has not demolished any structure or any advertisement allotted to the petitioner on the railway over bridge etc.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after going through the aforesaid reply filed on behalf of respondent No.3, he does not intend to press the instant writ petition any further.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

6. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

09.07.2025
Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

2. Whether reportable : Yes/No