

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

**CWP No. 5813 of 2016
Date of decision: 26.04.2016**

Skylight Hospitality Private Limited

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAJ RAHUL GARG**

Present : Mr. R. Kartikeya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. B. R. Mahajan, Advocate General, Haryana,
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. AG, Haryana,
Ms. Mamta Singla Talwar, DAG, Haryana.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to supply the complete information/documents/records on the basis of which notice dated 12.10.2015 (Annexure P-1) has been issued to the petitioner and not to proceed with the assessment proceedings until the complete relevant information/records/documents are furnished to the petitioner.

2. On March 29, 2016, while issuing notice of motion the following order was passed:

"The solitary prayer made in this writ petition is for supply of certain documents before passing the order in pursuance

to notice dated 12.10.21015 (P-1). It was urged that despite various representations/requests to the authorities, the requisite documents have not been supplied and respondent No. 3 is proceeding to pass order."

3. The State counsel has filed reply in the form of affidavit of Sh. S.S. Siwach, Excise & Taxation Officer-cum-Assessing Authority, Gurgaon (West) on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3. Para No. 5 of the affidavit is quoted as under:

"5. That it is also brought to the kind notice of this Hon'ble Court that the petitioner vide application (Annexure P-7 to P-10) has only repeated the contentions made in Annexure P-6. The documents available with the deponent pertaining to this case had already been handed over to the petitioner on 27.11.2015. However, the petitioner went on filing applications for supply of the same documents repeatedly."

4. It has been stated by learned Advocate General that documents which were available with them have been supplied to the petitioner and they do not have any other document which can be supplied to the petitioner.

5. In view of above, no further order is called for in the matter. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

**(RAJ RAHUL GARG)
JUDGE**

April 26, 2016
waseem