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

**CWP No.9819 of 2014
Date of decision:10.05.2016**

Vipin Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

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

Mr. Suresh Singla, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has prayed for a writ in the nature of *mandamus* seeking a direction to respondent Nos.1 and 2 to consider the representation dated 27.03.2012 for the purpose of renewal of his Stamp Vendor license.

The petitioner has the Stamp Vendor License since the year 1996 bearing No.27/MA dated 02.12.1996, which is required to be renewed in every financial year. The petitioner has allegedly applied 11 days before expiry of the financial year for renewal of his license on 29.03.2012 for the period 01.04.2011 to 21.03.2012.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that license of the petitioner was not renewed rather he has been orally told by the respondents that they do not possess the license submitted by the petitioner and advised him that if he had lost the original license, then at least register a DDR so

that he may apply for a duplicate license. Since a divergent stand has been taken by the petitioner and the respondents about possession of the original license, therefore, it became a disputed question of fact which can be decided only on the basis of evidence.

Counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that the petitioner had also filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005, for seeking information about availability of the license with the respondents but the said application has not been decided so far and at this stage, he has made a request to pursue his application filed under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

In view of the request made by the counsel for the petitioner at this stage, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file it again in case he gets some evidence to prove that the license is in possession of the respondents.

May 10, 2016
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge