



105 CWP-13351-2018 (O&M)

-1-

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

**CWP-13351-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.05.2026**

Aneet Goel **....Petitioner.**

Versus

Union of India and others **....Respondents.**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY, JUDGE**

Present:- Mr. Kartik Gandhi, Advocate,
for Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Addl. Solicitor General of India,
(arguing counsel through VC),
with Ms. Saigeeta Srivastava, Advocate
for respondent/UOI.

Mr. Amit Jhanji, Sr. Standing Counsel (arguing counsel)
Mr. Sumeet Jain, Addl. Standing Counsel, UT Chandigarh,
(arguing counsel)
Mr. Abhinav Sood, Addl. Standing Counsel, UT
Chandigarh, with
Mr. Himanshu Arora, Advocate;
Mr. Nitesh Jhahria, Advocate,
Mr. Parminder Singh Kanwar, Advocate, and
Mr. Jasbir Singh, Advocate,
for respondent – UT Chandigarh.

Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, Standing Counsel (arguing counsel)
Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2/MC Chandigarh.

.....



105 CWP-13351-2018 (O&M)

-2-

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

This petition (PIL) has been filed by the petitioner/Aneet Goel, who is a resident of Chandigarh, pointing out certain deficiencies in the municipal function, which are as mentioned below: -

I. Whether the official respondents are duty bound to maintain the greenery and save the green belts of the city?

II. Whether the green belt of the city is being depleted because of the negligence of the respondents?

III. Whether there is any enforcement agency, who can put a check upon the illegal parking especially upon the green belt areas and public parks?

IV. Whether the respondents are negligent of preserving the ecology?

V. Whether the respondents are duty bound to decide the representation of the petitioner and act upon the same in a time bound period being emergent?

VI. Whether the fundamental right to life as provided under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is being effected because of deterioration of green areas?

VII. Whether the Respondent No.2 is guilty of mis-utilizing public funds for profitable purposes?

VIII. Whether the rights of public have been violated by the Respondent No.2 and its administration, due to misappropriation of public funds?

IX. Whether the Petitioner is entitled to such other reliefs, as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant, in the circumstances of the present case?

2. Status report filed by Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, respondent No. 2 dated 11.03.2024, indicates that whatever deficiencies have been pointed out in this petition, have either been removed or are in the process of being removed.

**105 CWP-13351-2018 (O&M)**

3. In view of the aforesaid status report dated 11.03.2024 (*supra*), it is obvious that respondents have shown their *bona fides*, and therefore, no useful purpose would be served to keep this petition pending.

4. Accordingly, this petition (PIL) is disposed of. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner in case of any grievance unredressed, he shall be free to revisit the Court.

5. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE**

14.05.2026

preeti

i)	<i>Whether speaking/reasoned?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
ii)	<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>