

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

(202)

CWP-7008-1997

Decided on: February 13, 2017.

Sandeep Bus Service Pvt. Ltd., Mansa

.... Petitioner

Versus

State Transport Commissioner and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Anupam Bansal, Advocate, for
Mr. Ashu M. Punchhi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Anu Pal, AAG, Punjab, for respondents No. 1 and 2.

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

The present writ petition has been listed for hearing being incomplete case. The writ petition was admitted on 20.05.1997 by the Division Bench of this Court. Respondents No. 1 to 3 are reported to have not still been served.

Learned State counsel has put in appearance and brought to the notice of this Court an order passed by a Division Bench of this Court in CWP-15786-1999 titled M/s Vijayant Travels and another Vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 20.12.2012.

As per the said judgment, Punjab Mini Bus Service Scheme has been quashed and the mini bus permits issued/renewed earlier have also been declared illegal. The permits issued have been declared to be illegal, null and void.

In the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the agenda of the State Transport Commissioner dated 01.05.1997 to consider

the application for regular carriage permits in respect of mini buses on different routes mentioned in the said proceedings. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition, is that vide Annexure P-1, the State Transport Commissioner has rejected the application of respondent No.3 for carriage permits on Mansa-Burj Dhilwan Via Thuthianawali-Bhaini Bagha-Bhai Desa-Burj Rathi-Ubba.

Since respondent No.3 had applied for stage carriage permit and had been rejected, the petitioner sought a direction that respondent No.3 should not be considered under the Mini Bus Scheme. Since the Scheme has already been rejected, the claim of petitioner has rendered invalid as at present there is no scheme for grant of routes permit to mini buses.

This petition having rendered infructuous, there is no need to serve respondent No.3.

In view of above said circumstances, this petition is dismissed as having rendered infructuous at this stage without prejudice to the other legal rights of the petitioner.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

February 13, 2017
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No