

117-2

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

CWP No.21935 of 2016

Date of Decision: 21.10.2016

M/s Selvel Media Services Pvt. Ltd.

. . . Petitioner

Versus

Municipal Corporation U.T. Chandigarh and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Rameshwar Singh Malik, J. (Oral)

Present writ petition is directed against a demand notice dated 01.09.2016 (Annexure P-4), whereby the petitioner was directed to deposit the amount in question within a period of seven days.

Petitioner filed its reply to the notice vide Annexure P-5 dated 09.09.2016, making a request to the competent authority to withdraw the abovesaid demand notice. Petitioner had also moved a representation dated 19.08.2016 (Annexure P-6). A bare reading of the impugned demand notice and the reply/representations filed thereto, would make it crystal clear that no final order has been passed by the competent authority so far. Instant writ petition is directed against an incomplete action, which is not maintainable, as such.

CWP No.21935 of 2016

It goes without saying that the moment an appropriate order is passed by the competent authority, petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

However, keeping in view the peculiar fact situation of the case in hand and also in the interest of justice, it is directed that the order passed taking final action, if goes against the petitioner, shall remain in abeyance for a period of one week, enabling the petitioner to challenge the same, before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law.

With the above said observations made, instant writ petition stands disposed of.

[RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK]
JUDGE

21.10.2016
sachin

Whether Speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether Reportable : No