

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

DATE OF DECISION: MAY 28, 2015

Engineers & Associates

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

U.T. Chandigarh and another

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. Arvind Thakur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of counsel for the petitioner that two works were allotted to the petitioner and were duly executed in the years 2008 and 2013 respectively. Despite making various representations and approaching the respondents personally as well, the petitioner has not been released the amount due till date. Counsel contends that an amount of ₹ 1,40,000/- is due from the respondents and, therefore, the petitioner has even served a notice through counsel dated 11.02.2015 (Annexure P-3) upon respondent No.2, claiming therein the amount due alongwith 18% because of delay in payment. The said legal notice has also not been responded to.

Counsel contends that the petitioner, at this stage, would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Executive Engineer, C.P. Division

No.1, Sector 9, Chandigarh-respondent No.2 to consider and decide the legal notice dated 11.02.2015 (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner, within some specified time.

In view of the statement made by the counsel for the petitioner and without going into the merit of the case or commenting thereon, the present writ petition is disposed of with directions to the Executive Engineer, C.P. Division No.1, Sector 9, Chandigarh-respondent No.2 to consider and decide the legal notice dated 11.02.2015 (Annexure P-3) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

In case the claim of the petitioner is accepted, the consequential benefits, if any, be released to it, in accordance with law, within a further period of one month.

In case the claim of the petitioner is not to be accepted, then a well reasoned and speaking order be passed and conveyed to the petitioner forthwith.

May 28, 2015
khurmi

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE