

Sunil Kumar Sharma and others Vs. Union of India and others

Present : Mr. Anand Chhibbar, Senior Advocate (arguing counsel), with  
Mr. Karan Gaba, Advocate,  
Mr. Vijiyesh Malhotra, Advocate,  
Ms. Ateevraj Sandhu, Advocate, and  
Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Addl. Solicitor General of India  
(arguing counsel), with  
Mr. Karanvir Singh Kathuria, Central Govt. Counsel,  
for respondents No.1 and 3.

Mr. Rishi Kaushal, Advocate (arguing counsel), and  
Ms. Komal Bishnoi, Advocate,  
for respondent No.2 – NHAI.

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Senior DAG, Punjab,  
for respondents No.4 and 6.

Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,  
for respondent No.5.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate,  
for respondent No.7.

\* \* \*

CM-156-CWPIL-2026

Annexures P-13 and P-14 filed by the petitioners are taken on record.

Accordingly, **CM-156-CWPIL-2026** stands allowed.

CWP-PIL-70-2026

1. This Court put a pointed query to learned counsel for respondent No.2 – NHAI as to whether the States of Punjab and Haryana are ready and willing to give public land in close vicinity for afforestation in lieu of 5000 trees proposed to be cut for construction of new Zirakpur – Panchkula bypass.

1.1 Learned counsel for respondent No.2 – NHAI has no answer to the aforesaid query and prays for time to seek instructions.

1.2 Learned counsel for respondent No.2 – NHAI is also directed to submit all re-alignment proposals that were made before it by the technical team of NHAI, to enable this Court to find out as to whether mind was applied contemplating an alternative site for construction of proposed bypass.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that as per Indian State Forest Report 2023 (Annexure P-10), forest cover in the State of Haryana is only 3.65% of geographical area.

3. In view of above, it appears that the functionaries of the State of Haryana are neither serious nor they seem conscious of the impending ecological catastrophe.

3.1 In view of above, inactivity of the respondents requires drastic remedial measures by this Court.

4. Accordingly, this Court prohibits the cutting of any tree of any age/specie in the State of Haryana, including cutting of approximately 5000 trees proposed to be cut for construction of Zirakpur – Panchkula bypass, without permission of this Court, till the next date of hearing.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 – NHAI assures that no tree for construction of proposed bypass will be cut till any further order is passed by this Court.

6. List on 17.04.2026.

( SHEEL NAGU )  
CHIEF JUSTICE

( SANJIV BERRY )  
JUDGE

April 01, 2026  
narotam