

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

DATE OF DECISION: MAY 15, 2015

M/s Irrigreen Corporation, Mohali

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Union Territory, Chandigarh, and others

....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. Puran Singh Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has approached this Court with a grievance that despite having executed the work assigned to it and the revised estimate also approved and sent for sanction of the bills as assessed by the Executive Engineer, Horticulture Division No.2, Chandigarh-respondent No.4, the payment is not being made to it on the ground that approval has yet to come from the Chief Engineer, Department of Horticulture, U.T., Chandigarh. Counsel contends that the petitioner has served a legal notice, through counsel, dated 10.09.2014 (Annexure P-4) upon the respondents but that also has not solicited any response.

Counsel contends that the petitioner, at this stage, would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Chief Engineer, Union Territory, Chandigarh and the Executive Engineer, Horticulture Division No.2, Sector

23, Chandigarh-respondent Nos.2 and 4 respectively to consider and decide the legal notice dated 10.09.2014 (Annexure P-4) 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 Chief Engineer, Union Territory, Chandigarh and the Executive Engineer, Horticulture Division No.2, Sector 23, Chandigarh-respondent Nos.2 and 4 respectively to consider and decide the legal notice dated 10.09.2014 (Annexure P-4) within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Decision so taken be conveyed to the petitioner forthwith.

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 three weeks.

May 15, 2015
khurmi

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE