

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
121**

CWP No. 12854 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION: July 02, 2015

M/s Rajinder Singh Manmohan Rai, Amritsar

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Food Corporation of India and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. G.C.Dhuriwala, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of the counsel for the petitioner that the security amount of ₹ 3,40,000/- deposited by the petitioner in pursuance to the work allotted to it in the year 2006, which work was completed in the year 2008, has not been refunded till date despite a notice through counsel dated 30.03.2015 (Annexure P-2) served by the petitioner, which has been responded to by respondent No. 2 vide communication dated 10.06.2015 (Annexure P-3) by indicating that there are certain objections for the clearance of the said amount. Counsel for the petitioner states that once the work assigned to the petitioner has been duly completed and the contract having been finished, the petitioner is entitled to the refund of the security amount as per the contract. The respondents are inordinately delaying the

said process of releasing of the amount to the petitioner and, therefore, he prays that a direction may be issued to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for releasing of the security amount at an early date.

In the light of the statement made by the counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of with directions to the respondents to finalize the claim of the petitioner with regard to the refund of the security amount of ₹ 3,40,000/- deposited by the petitioner vide receipt No. 87571 dated 08.06.2006 and receipt No. 43946 dated 23.10.2006 for the transport contract at R.H. Chhehrata from 23.10.2006 to 15.10.2008 vide contract No. S&C/2/1/TC/BRL/Cont/06 dated 17.10.2006, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the 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, a well-reasoned speaking order be passed and conveyed to the petitioner forthwith.

July 02, 2015
pj

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE