

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14760 of 2017
Date of decision:05.09.2017

C.S.Arora

... Petitioner

Vs.

Union of India and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present:- Mr. Jagjot Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

1. In this writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus to issue directions to the respondents to comply with the Gas Cylinder Rules, 2016, particularly Rule 6(2)(A)(IV) and Rule 9(3) (V) which deal with the stamping of warning signs and last date of the last hydrostatic test or hydrostatic stretch test on LPG cylinders.

2. At the outset, on a query being put to the learned counsel for the petitioner, as to whether any representation has been made to the concerned respondents, i.e., 2, 3 and 4, it was candidly admitted that at this stage, no representation has been filed. Accordingly, a prayer was made that separate representations shall be submitted to respondents No.2, 3 and 4 within a period of one month. Further prayer was made that the concerned

respondents be directed to decide the same in a time bound manner.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the averments made in the petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, we dispose of the writ petition by permitting the petitioner to file separate representations before respondents No.2, 3 and 4 within a period of one month from today. In case such representations are filed, the same shall be decided by the said respondents, i.e., 2, 3 and 4 within a period of next two months in accordance with law after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and by passing a speaking order.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

September 05, 2017
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No