



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANDEEP N. BHATT

ON THE 7<sup>th</sup> OF APRIL, 2026

WRIT PETITION No. 11538 of 2026

*AIRPLAZA RETAIL HOLDINGS PRIVATE LIMITED*

*Versus*

*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

.....  
Appearance:

Shri Mrigendra Singh Baghel - Senior Advocate assisted by Shri Suyash Mohan Guru, Shri Dev Sharma, Shri Aniket Tiwari - Advocates for the petitioner.

Shri A.S. Baghel - Government Advocate and Shri Narunaditya Singh - Panel Lawyer for the State.

Shri Sourabh Sunder - Advocate for the respondents/Corporation.  
.....

ORDER

The present petition has been filed praying the following reliefs:

"A. That, this Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, quashing the impugned challan bearing Book No. 608, Serial No. 018 dated 27.03.2026 (AnnexureP/5) issued by the Respondents and all consequential actions taken pursuant thereto;

B. That, this Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, quashing the impugned order dated 30.03.2026 cancelling the Petitioner's Trade License(Annexure P/6), being arbitrary, illegal, and in violation of the principles of natural justice;



C. That, this Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the Respondents to restore the Petitioner's Trade License and permit the Petitioner to continue its business operations at the subject premises without any interference;

D. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to restrain the Respondents from taking any further coercive action, including interference with the Petitioner's peaceful possession and lawful business operations at the subject premises; and

E. That, the trade license of the Petitioner may be renewed which is expiring today, that is, March 31, 2026.

F, That, any other relief as this Hon'ble Court deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case, may also kindly be granted."

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Counsel for the respondents has filed reply and petitioner has also filed rejoinder. The main concern of the petitioner is that though the notice is issued after joint inspection carried out of the petitioner's premises by the respondents authority by giving fifteen days' time however, within a period of two days therefrom, the authorities have again inspected the premises in question and thereafter proceeded further to seal the premises on the ground that there is no proper or sufficient action taken by the petitioner.

3. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the present petitioner is doing business and is having a good reputation in the city. The company is concerned with regard to loss of business and also loss of reputation. Therefore, the case of the present petitioner may be considered appropriately by considering



the conduct and highhanded action of the respondents/Corporation in appropriate manner.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondents/Corporation submits that on joint inspection of the premises of the petitioner, it is found that there are several deficiencies in Fire Safety system as well as other aspects like unhygienic condition of washrooms, etc. and accordingly notice was issued to the petitioner and thereafter when the team of the respondents/Corporation visited again after a day, it is found that there was no progress or improvement and thereafter considering the recent incident which has taken place in the city regarding fire incident and difficulty faced by public at large, such action has been taken in the larger interest of public. However, it is fairly submitted by counsel for the respondents/Corporation that authorities have no personal agenda against the present petitioner and action is taken in larger interest of citizens, and if the petitioner cooperates by responding the notice of the Corporation by taking corrective measures as required and indicated in the notice by doing necessary works regarding Fire Safety system and other deficiencies pointed out by the Corporation, on that condition seal can be reopened. It is further submitted that competent officer of the petitioner may file an undertaking to take such corrective measures to cure the deficiencies within a prescribed period.

5. Heard counsel for the parties and perused the documents.

6. Considering the submissions made by counsel for the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing much on the merits of the contentions raised by the parties, in the interest of justice, it is directed that seal of the petitioner's premises shall be opened on filing of an undertaking by the competent officer of the petitioner, namely, Shri Anand Sharma, Assistant Store



Manager with his necessary identity before this Court and also before the Corporation by mentioning that they will carry out all the necessary works to cure the deficiencies as pointed out by the respondents/Corporation in the impugned notice by taking all corrective measures in satisfactory manner by or before 15.04.2026. Such an affidavit/undertaking shall be filed by Shri Anand Sharma, Assistant Store Manager along with power of attorney given by the highest authority of the petitioner/Company by way of resolution or in an appropriate mode by tomorrow i.e. 08.04.2026. After the entire necessary works are carried out and deficiencies are cured as indicated by the Corporation, it will be open to the respondents/Corporation to visit/inspect the premises of the petitioner in the evening of 15th April, 2026 and if it is found satisfactory, then Corporation shall do the needful. If the work of the petitioner is not found satisfactory, then it will be open for the respondents/Corporation to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law.

7. With the aforesaid directions and observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

C.C. as per rules in course of the day.

(SANDEEP N. BHATT)  
JUDGE