

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

CWP No.14895 of 2016
Date of Decision : 28.7.2016

Inderjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

P.R.T.C. Patiala and another

.....Respondents

...

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

...

Present : Mr. Raj Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

1. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
2. Whether the judgement should be reported in Digest ?

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J

Feeling aggrieved against the alleged inaction on the part of respondent authorities, petitioner has approached this Court, by way of instant writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of Mandamus.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that when the genuine grievance of the petitioner was not being redressed by the respondent authorities, he finally approached respondent No.2 by way of representation dated 11.5.2016 (Annexure P-3), but the same is also pending decision. He further submits that the petitioner will be satisfied in case respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide his representation, within a reasonable time.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, including the issue of limitation, if any, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, Managing Director, Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala-respondent No.2 is directed to look into the matter, consider the grievance of the petitioner, raised vide his representation dated 11.5.2016 (Annexure P-3) and decide the same, at an early date by passing an appropriate order thereon, strictly in accordance with law, but in any case within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

With the abovesaid observations made and directions issued, present petition stands disposed of.

28.7.2016
GS

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No