

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

DATE OF DECISION: APRIL 24, 2015

M/s Arora Industry, District Bhatinda

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

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

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. Jaspreet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of counsel for the petitioner that the Truck Union, Goniana, District Bathinda, for which President and Member have been impleaded as respondent Nos.4 and 5, are not permitting the petitioner to hire any other truck except for the one from the Truck Union, Goniana, which, the counsel contends is illegal and violative of Article 19 (g) of the Constitution of India. He contends that respondent Nos.4 and 5, at times, are not permitting the petitioner to load the trucks, if hired by it from other sources than the Truck Union, Goniana and further sometimes, the trucks hired by the petitioner are damaged and the Drivers and Cleaners manhandled.

The petitioner has made a representation dated 10.04.2014

(Annexure P-1) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda,

highlighting therein its grievance. Copy of the same has also been sent to the Station House Officer, Police Station Goniana, District Bathinda-respondent No.3, for information and necessary action but nothing has been done till date.

Counsel contends that the petitioner, at this stage, would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Station House Officer, Police Station Goniana, District Bathinda-respondent No.3 to consider and decide the representation dated 10.04.2014 (Annexure P-1) moved by the petitioner, within some specified time. He further states that as and when such a situation as highlighted in the writ petition and recorded in the above paras arise, the petitioner would make a representation to respondent No.3, who may consider the same and take appropriate steps as permissible under the law.

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 Station House Officer, Police Station Goniana, District Bathinda-respondent No.3 to consider and decide the representation dated 10.04.2014 (Annexure P-1) as moved by the petitioner and take appropriate steps in accordance with law. The same would be the situation, if a subsequent representation made by the petitioner to the said respondent.

April 24, 2015
khurmi

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE