

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

235

Civil Writ Petition No.12116 of 2013

Date of Decision: July 03, 2015

Tilak Raj and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Puneet Kaur Sekhon, Additional Advocate General,
Punjab.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

The present writ petition has been filed challenging the orders dated 09.12.2011 (Annexure P-3), 16.02.2012 (Annexure P-4) and 08.03.2013 (Annexure P-6) passed by respondents 1 to 3.

It is the contention of the counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners were initially in partnership with the husband of respondent No.4-Charan Kaur but after the death of the husband of respondent No.4 i.e. Mohan Lal, a secret arrangement was entered into between Charan Kaur-respondent No.4 and some other persons, which had the effect to ousting the running of brickkiln, which is actually being run by the petitioners. The said arrangement has resulted in some orders being passed by the competent authorities on the proceedings, which were initiated by Charan Kaur-respondent No.4, in which the petitioners were neither given any notices nor they were informed of the same. Their rights have been prejudiced adversely by violating the principles of natural justice.

When the petitioners came to know of the said fact, they filed proceedings

against the authorities and respondent No.4 but by the impugned orders, the claims of the petitioners have been rejected without giving them any right to pursue their matters as regards their claims. He thus contends that the impugned orders cannot sustain.

I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the records of the case as also the impugned orders.

The orders, which have been passed by the competent authorities are in accordance with law and the matter has been dealt with in details. The reasoning assigned by the authorities are in consonance with the provisions as contained under law. No interference in the said orders is called for. It goes without saying that there is nothing in the orders, which would disentitle the petitioners to their claims except for the one, which has been highlighted in the proceedings before respondents 1 to 3. If the petitioners have any other grievance apart from the one, which has been highlighted and rejected by the respondents 1 to 3, the petitioners may agitate the same in accordance with law, if permissible.

July 03, 2015
Puneet

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE