

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.10080 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision:29.09.2015

M.L. Sharma

... Petitioner

v.

HUDA & others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.J. VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present: Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Advocate for HUDA.

...

S.J. VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE.

The petitioner has challenged a notice dated 16.04.2015 (Annexure P-28) calling upon him to show cause why penalty ought not to be imposed upon him. The petitioner had replied to the same. There is no warrant for interfering with the show cause notice at this stage.

The petitioner has also challenged a demand notice dated 29.01.2015 (Annexure P-26) towards extension fee for a sum of Rs.18,71,216.00/-. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that a representation against the same has already been filed before the respondents. It is not necessary at this stage to consider the validity of the demand made by their letter. Firstly, the petitioner had replied to the same. Secondly, no further action had been taken pursuant to the demand notice dated 29.01.2015. The petitioner only apprehends that the respondents may take action pursuant thereto. It will be necessary to consider the petitioner's case against the demand notice only if the respondents take any action pursuant thereto. They may not do so after considering the petitioner's reply/representation thereto. If, however, they do so, the petitioner is always

at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law. In the event of the demand notice prejudicing the petitioner at any stage in any particular manner, it would be open for the petitioner to challenge even the demand notice.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of with liberty as aforesaid.

**(S.J. VAZIFDAR)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

29.09.2015
harjeet