

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

CWP No.16588 of 2016
Date of Decision : 17.8.2016

Manpreet Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

...

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

...

Present : Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Feeling aggrieved against the alleged inaction on the part of respondent authorities, petitioners have approached this court by way of present writ petition, under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of Mandamus.

Learned counsel for the petitioners refers to numerous communications to contend that the matter is not being taken to its logical end by the respondent authorities. When no appropriate action was being taken, petitioners finally approached the respondent authorities by way of legal notice Annexure P-8, but no action has been taken till date. He prays for allowing the present writ petition, by issuing an appropriate writ against the respondent authorities.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners at considerable length, careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful

consideration to the contentions raised, this court is of the considered opinion that so far as the legal notice Annexure P-8 is concerned, it is undated. It has been wrongly claimed to be dated 19.7.2016 in para 8 of the writ petition, which is factually incorrect. Learned counsel for the petitioners sought to clarify this aspect, referring to some postal receipts, which are not even placed on record. However, in the absence of any relevant averments taken in para 8 or in any other paragraph of the writ petition, Annexure P-8 cannot be connected with postal receipts.

So far as the action on the part of respondent authorities is concerned, learned counsel for the petitioners himself has referred to numerous communications from Annexures P-2 to P-6, which shows that respondent authorities are proceeding in the matter. In fact, it seems that petitioners are having some personal grudge against private respondents no.8 and 9, being their co-villagers. They want to settle their personal scores with the private respondents by moving the present writ petition, which has been found wholly misconceived.

Further, petitioners are not without remedy. No prejudice of any kind, whatsoever, has been shown to have been caused to the petitioners, which may entitle them to file and maintain the present writ petition before this court.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this court is of the considered opinion that the present writ petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission of this court to withdraw the present writ petition.

Permission is granted.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

17.8.2016
GS

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No