



2025:AHC:156588-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 801 of 2025

Ashok Puri

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and 3 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Anil Kumar Dubey, Ram Milan Dwivedi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: A.S.G.I., C.S.C., Pranjal Mehrotra

Chief Justice's Court

**HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.**

1. This petition purportedly in public interest has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction to the respondent nos. 2 & 3 to open median cut at Jhansi - Lalitpur Road, National Highway No. 44 in front of Gram - Khari, Baijpur Ramgarh - Jhansi Raod.
2. Submission has been made that a median cut was available in front of the village, however, on account of some road accidents near the said location, the median cut has been closed by the National Highway Authority of India, which is resulting in inconvenience to the commuters of the village and therefore, the respondents be directed to open the said median cut on the National Highway.
3. Counsel appearing for the National Highway Authority of India submits that after the complaints were made pertaining to the safety concern on account of existence of the median cut, a road safety audit was undertaken by the Road Safety Audit Firm, which made recommendations for closing down median opening, which was in front of the retail outlet as besides the same being dangerous, the same was contrary to the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Road Transport & Highways.
4. Counsel for the petitioner made submissions that as the other cut is at a distance of about one and half kilometer, the commuters to and fro the village have to travel a long distance and on that count also, the respondents be directed to reconsider.

5. Having considered the submissions made as well as the report produced by the respondent - National Highways Authority of India, we do not find any reason to entertain the present petition inasmuch as the decision has been taken based on an expert report and this Court cannot substitute its opinion *qua* the expert report.

6. Further, so far as the distance of other cut at a distance of one and half kilometer is concerned, on a National Highway a distance of one and half kilometer cannot be said to be too excessive for this Court to interfere. Even otherwise, not having a median cut just in front of the entrance of the village essentially is to the welfare of the villagers as the same necessarily would result in accident.

7. In view thereof, we do not find any reason to entertain the present petition. The same is, therefore, **dismissed**.

(Kshitij Shailendra,J.) (Arun Bhansali,CJ.)

September 4, 2025
nd