

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.18358 of 2016
Date of decision:5.9.2016**

Tiger Force (The Public Helpline) Regd.

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

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

Present: Mr.Rohit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the impugned order dated 18.3.2016 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No.2, petitioner has 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 certiorari for quashing the impugned order. Petitioner also seeks a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondent authorities to allow the application (Annexure P-1), furnished by the petitioner.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

It is a matter of record that when petitioner submitted his application (Annexure P-1), it was not found in order and the impugned order (Annexure P-2) dated 18.3.2016 was passed by respondent No.2, intimating the petitioner in this regard. However, instead of complying the requirements pointed out by respondent No.2 in the impugned order, petitioner surprisingly issued a legal notice dated 30.3.2016 (Annexure P-3), which was duly replied by respondent No.2 vide its self-contained reply (Annexure P-4).

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner could not substantiate any of his arguments. Another similar applicant, who complied with all the requirements including deposit of requisite fees, has been granted permission. In this view of the matter, no mandamus can be issued in favour of the petitioner, at the hands of this Court, because that site is no more available.

So far as the impugned order (Annexure P-2) is concerned, no illegality has been found in the said order. Further, no prejudice has been pointed out, which might have been caused to the petitioner by passing the impugned order so as to enable this Court to exercise its writ jurisdiction under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India.

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 view that the impugned order has not been found to be suffering from any patent illegality or perversity. Instant writ petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out

Resultantly, with the above-said observations made, the present writ petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

5.9.2016
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No