

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).2953/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09-01-2026 in CWP No.11/2026 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

SUMAN MARBLES & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 18637/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 30-01-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nasir Ahmad, Adv.
Mr. Mohammad Muzahir Husain, Adv.
Mr. Emamuddin Azmi, Adv.
Dr. Siddhartha Priya Ashok, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Varun Chugh, Adv.
Mr. Katahiamang P., Adv.
Mr. Sumit, Adv.
Mr. Samar Vijay Singh, AOR
Ms. Sabarni Som, Adv.
Mr. Aman Dev Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Keshav Mittal, Adv.
Mr. Gaj Singh, Adv.

Mr. Atul Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Thukral, Adv.
Mr. Amit Gupta, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Order dated 09.01.2026 of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh¹ is impugned in this special leave petition. By such order, notice

¹ High Court

was directed to be issued on the writ petition² filed by the petitioners seeking relief against demolition of their shop room(s) by the respondents; however, interim stay, as prayed was not granted.

2. On 20.01.2026, we passed the following order on this petition:

“1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Samar Vijay Singh, learned counsel for the respondent-State of Haryana is present in Court. He has been requested to accept notice on behalf of the State of Haryana.

3. Formal service of notice is dispensed with.

4. Till 30th January, 2026, let no further demolition of the petitioners' property/shop be effected.

5. Dasti, in addition, is permitted.

6. Re-list the special leave petition on 30th January, 2026.

3. It has now been brought to our notice that another writ petition³ was preferred before the High Court by Marble Market Dealers Association (Regd.)⁴ on the self-same cause of action and seeking similar relief, which the petitioners claimed in their writ petition. Order dated 14.01.2026 of the High Court declined interim relief to the Association too.

4. The said order dated 14.01.2026 was challenged by the Association before this Court in SLP (C) No.3403/2026. The said special leave petition, however, has been dismissed on 27.01.2026 by a three-Judge Bench presided over by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India. The order reads as follows:

“1. We have heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner(s).

2. In view of the fact that the matter is pending before the High Court, there is no reason for us to entertain this Special Leave Petition. Moreover, since the land of the petitioner(s) is sought to be utilised for the purpose of construction of a very prestigious project, namely, the construction of a metro railway line in a congested place/city like Gurugram, we are not inclined to interfere with the taking over of possession of the land for that purpose. The Special Leave Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

² CWP No.11/2026 (O&M)

³ CWP No.44/2026 (O&M)

⁴ Association

3. However, taking over of land and its utilisation for metro project development shall not in any manner cause prejudice to the rights of the members of the petitioner association, if any, to seek rehabilitation/alternative site or compensation for the acquired land. All such issues can be raised before the High Court in the pending writ petition. We request the High Court to examine these aspects and take up the matter on the date fixed.
4. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.”
5. It is not in dispute that the petitioners before us are members of the Association, being the petitioner in SLP (C) No.3403/2026.
6. Having regard to the order of the three-Judge Bench, we find no reason to entertain this petition and continue the *ad interim* order of stay granted on 20.01.2026. Ad interim stay stands vacated.
7. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Khanna, learned senior counsel, appearing for the petitioners at this stage informs us that the petitioners have applied for a review of the order dated 27.01.2026.
8. We may only observe that such an application for review, once listed for consideration, may be decided by the relevant bench. We express no opinion on its merits.
9. Mr. Khanna also invites our attention to page 61 of the petition, being a public notice issued by the Estate Officer-II, HSVP, Gurugram, whereby, the allottees of Marble Market, Sector 33, Gurugram were called upon to immediately shift to an alternate site at Sector 33, Gurugram.
10. Mr. Khanna complains that no such alternate site has been informed to the petitioners.
11. If indeed that be so, it shall be open to the petitioners to approach the Estate Officer for identification of the alternate site, where they may shift their business.
12. The special leave petition stands dismissed, with the aforesaid

observations.

13. All pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)