

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

CWP No.9282 of 2015

Date of Decision:12/05/2015

Darshan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. I.P.S. Doabia, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. To be referred to the reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

It is the admitted position that against the order impugned in the present writ petition, the petitioner has availed the statutory remedy of revision before respondent No.1.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the revision petition was filed on 4.4.2014 and even after the passage of one year, the same remains undecided.

In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, I consider it appropriate to direct respondent No.1 to take a final decision on the revision petition preferred by the petitioner against the order dated 14.12.2013 (Annexure P-10) passed by the Secretary, Punjab Mandi Board, Chandigarh by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, preferably within two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioner and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioner, he would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

12.05.2015
rajeev