

---

**(2026) 02 UK CK 1829**

**In the Uttarakhand High Court**

**Case No : Writ Petition Miscellaneous Single No. 3293 Of 2025**

Arun Kumar And Ors.

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Uttarakhand And Ors

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision : 20-02-2026**

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation : (2026) 02 UK CK 1829**

**Hon'ble Judges : Pankaj Purohit, J**

**Bench : Single Bench**

**Advocate : Matloob Rawat, Anil Dabral, Suyash Pant, B.S. Koranga**

**Final Decision : Dismissed**

---

## **Judgement**

Pankaj Purohit, J

1. By means of the present writ petition, petitioners have sought the indulgence of this Court for a direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to decide the representations dated 03.11.2025 and 19.02.2025 submitted by petitioners (Annexure Nos.6 and 7) as expeditiously as possible or within a stipulated time.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioners that there happens to be water logging in front of houses of petitioners due to raising the interlocking tiles of the streets. Private respondents have instituted a Civil Suit dated 05.07.2025 i.e. Original Suit No.286 of 2025 Anil and Ors. Vs. Dharmveer Singh and Ors., before the Court of learned Civil Judge (Jr. Div.), Haridwar, seeking injunction against the respondent-Authority not to remove the interlocking tile and to construct the street one feet down.

3. It is further contended by him that learned Trial Court vide order dated 24.09.2025, passed ad interim injunction in favour of the private respondents injuncting respondent-Authority not to change the level of street. Against this order, private respondents are already in Misc. Civil Appeal No.294 of 2025 Anil and Ors. Vs. Dharmveer Singh and Ors., which is still pending disposal before

learned District Judge, Haridwar.

4. When learned Civil Court is cognizant with the matter which is sought to be resolved by filing the present writ petition, this Court is of the view that Court's hands are tight to interfere in the matter. Petitioners may pursue the aforesaid appeal before learned District Judge, Haridwar. Since matter is already pending before the learned Trial Court between petitioners and private respondents, thus, there is no interference warranted by this Court.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition fails and is dismissed in-limine.