

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

**LPA-2497-2025 (O&M)**

**Reserved on : 28.10.2025**

**Date of Pronouncement : 31.10.2025**

Anand Moudgil

... Appellant

Versus

The Statutory Body-State Transport Authority-UT of Chandigarh

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present: Appellant in-person.

\*\*\*\*\*

**H.S.GREWAL, J.**

1. This appeal has been filed against the order dated 21.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Bench in CWP-20220-2025 whereby the claim of the appellant (petitioner therein) for grant of 'Stage Carriage Permit' to operate vehicles from the Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh to Fazilka and Bathinda had been rejected.

2. The appellant submitted that the Single Bench has erred in dismissing the writ petition as much as he has an indefeasible right to operate the buses from Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh to different cities of the State of Punjab including Fazilka and Bathinda but his application for grant of 'State Carriage Permit' has been rejected by the respondent-State Transport Authority, Chandigarh Administration, vide order dated 27.06.2025

(Annexure P-3), on the ground that there is a reciprocal agreement between Chandigarh Administration and Government of Punjab dated 04.06.2008, which was notified on 09.06.2008. He also submitted that once there is a liberalisation of policy that whosoever demands the permit, has to be given the same and the State is bound to consider his claim ignoring the fact that large number of permits have already been granted by the U.T. Administration.

3. Having considered the arguments advanced by the appellant and perused the material available on record.

4. The Single Bench vide impugned order dated 21.07.2025 has dismissed the aforesaid writ petition with following observations:-

*“9. A bare perusal of the above proviso would show that the permits can only be applied at the place where the applicant resides or has his principal place of business. The petitioner, who appears in person concedes that neither he resides in Chandigarh nor he has principal place of business in Chandigarh. That being so, claim of the petitioner that his application for the grant of stage carriage permit has not been accepted by the U.T. Chandigarh contrary to the provisions of 1988 Act and hence, cannot be accepted. Stage carriage permits can only be claimed by the petitioner from the State of Punjab where he resides or has his principal place of business and not from U.T. Chandigarh.*

*10. Even otherwise, in case, the petitioner has a permit to operate vehicles given by the State of Punjab, he can claim the benefit of reciprocal arrangement 2008 that too at the discretion of the Chandigarh Administration to ensure that only adequate number of vehicles are allowed to enter in Chandigarh so that normal traffic is not disturbed. Once, the Chandigarh Administration has made it clear that keeping in view 73 permits are already allowed under the reciprocal scheme 2008 and as the passengers are not having problem to commute to different cities of State of Punjab, the petitioner cannot claim permit under the reciprocal scheme 2008 as a matter of right under the liberalisation scheme. The said reciprocal arrangement can only be allowed in case, the same is needed for the convenience of the passengers and to ensure that no passenger suffers problem on any route to*

*commute but once, the particular competent authority comes to the conclusion that enough permits have already been granted on a particular route under reciprocal agreement, the claim of grant of permit cannot be raised under the reciprocal arrangement as a matter of right.*

*11. Further, nothing evident has been shown to this Court that the declining of the claim of the petitioner for the grant of permit is contrary to the reciprocal arrangement 2008, which has been entered into between the U.T. Chandigarh and the State of Punjab. Further, the petitioner has not impleaded the State of Punjab as party to the present petition for claiming the benefit of reciprocal arrangement 2008.”*

5. It is evident that the appellant neither resides in Chandigarh nor has his principal place of business there. In terms of the provision contained in the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, ‘Stage Carriage Permit’ can be applied for only at the place where the applicant resides or carries on his principal business. Once the appellant admittedly does not fulfill this statutory requirement, his claim for grant of ‘Stage Carriage Permit’ from the U.T. Chandigarh cannot be entertained.

6. Further, the reciprocal agreement dated 04.06.2008 between the Chandigarh Administration and the State of Punjab governs the operation of vehicles between the two territories and 73 permits have already been issued under the said arrangement and no permit has been granted to any private operator. The said reciprocal scheme is intended to regulate traffic flow and ensure convenience to passengers. It does not confer any vested or indefeasible right upon any private operator to claim a permit as a matter of course under the garb of liberalisation policy.

7. It is also noticeable that the appellant has not impleaded the State of Punjab, which is a necessary party for adjudicating any claim under the reciprocal arrangement dated 04.06.2008.

8. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the view taken by the learned Single Bench is based on a correct appreciation of law and facts, and does not suffer from any illegality or perversity warranting interference in the appellate jurisdiction.

9. Consequently, the LPA being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

10. However, it is made clear that dismissal of this appeal shall not preclude the appellant from approaching the competent authority in the State of Punjab for consideration of his claim for stage carriage permit in accordance with law.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)**  
**JUDGE**

**31.10.2025**  
A.Kaundal

**(H.S.GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

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