

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

244(1)

Civil Writ Petition No.6449 of 2015

The Naveen Co-operative Transport Society Ltd. and others

....Petitioners

versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

&

(2)

Civil Writ Petition No.6730 of 2015

The Ekta Co-operative Transport Society Ltd. and others

....Petitioners

versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

&

(3)

Civil Writ Petition No.7726 of 2015

The Vikas Co-operative Transport Society Ltd. and others

....Petitioners

versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Date of decision: 28.05.2015

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

Present: Mr. Amit Jhanji, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP No.6449 and 7726 of 2015.

Mr. Baldev Kapoor, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP No.6730 of 2015.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate
for respondents No.22, 23, 26, 27, 30
in CWP No.7726 of 2015.

Mr. Mahavir Malik, Advocate
for respondents No.28, 29 and 31 in CWP No.7726 of 2015.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

This order of mine shall dispose of CWP Nos.6449, 6730 and 7726 of 2015 as the issue involved in all the petitions is identical. However, the facts are being extracted from CWP No.6449 of 2015.

The grievance of the petitioners is that in compliance of order dated 17.03.2015 (Annexure P-16), the petitioners-societies are not being allowed to operate on their respective routes inspite of having valid permit as well as time table.

Learned State counsel submits that there is nothing on record to show that they are not being allowed to operate on their respective routes. He further submits that even in the written statement, it has been mentioned that the interest of any authority is not involved and in case, the petitioners are still having any grouse regarding plying of the vehicles by other persons then they may approach the concerned authority.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has also brought to the notice of this Court that in COCP Nos.504 and 505 of 2015, it was clearly mentioned by Director General, Transport Haryana, Chandigarh who was

present at the time of hearing of the contempt petitions that instructions dated 07.05.2015 shall be followed in letter and spirit and after giving the assurance by Advocate General, Haryana himself in the Court, the Contempt petitions were dismissed as withdrawn.

In view of order passed by this Court in COCP Nos.504 and 505 of 2015 on 07.05.2015, assurance given by learned Advocate General and also the stand taken in the written statement, nothing survives in the present petitions.

Learned counsel for respondents No.28, 29 and 31 submits that the material fact has been concealed by the petitioner as the permits issued to some of the petitioners have already been challenged and revision is still pending.

The dispute with regard to validity of permit is not subject matter of challenge in the present petition and the said respondents are at liberty to raise their plea before the appropriate authority.

In case, the petitioners are also having any grouse at any point of time, they are at liberty to approach the concerned authority.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

May 28, 2015
sonia g.