

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

CWP No. 18719 of 2017

Date of decision : 25.10.2017

Surinder Ghai

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana & ors.

....Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. D.S. Matya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Arya, Asst. A.G. Haryana.

RAJAN GUPTA J.

Petitioner has prayed for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct respondents no. 1 to 3 to restrain respondent no. 4 from carrying out any commercial activity in the Shopping Mall situated in Ambala. Petitioner alleges that respondent no. 4 namely Dinesh Grover was in connivance with the officials of Municipal Corporation, Ambala; Punjab and Sind Bank, Ambala and the partners of DSR Developers Pvt. Ltd. He had obtained wrongful profits by influencing the local officials. An FIR was also registered at police station Ambala City. According to him, land of Corporation was transferred in the name of DSR Developers Pvt. Ltd. which is illegal. Petitioner had made complaints to police and other authorities. He has also posed a challenge to gift deed dated 14.12.2007 on the ground that respondent no. 4 was in connivance with officials of the Corporation. He, thus, prays that a writ in the nature of mandamus be issued to restrain respondent no. 4 namely Dinesh Grover from carrying out any commercial

activity in Shopping Mall known as City Plaza. It is inexplicable why petitioner has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this court. The contentions made therein do not make any head or tail. Voluminous documents have been annexed with the petition in the shape of annexures. Counsel for the petitioner was repeatedly asked about the relevance of the same during the course of arguments. However, no clear answer was forthcoming. It appears that petitioner has some grievance against a private individual namely Dinesh Grover. Possibility that he has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this court to settle his score with him cannot be ruled out. Arguments raised during the course of hearing lacked substance. The tendency on behalf of certain litigants to file petition of such frivolous nature needs to be discouraged. It leads to wastage of precious time of the court for which petitioner needs to be saddled with costs. Under the circumstances, petition is hereby dismissed with ₹30,000/- as costs.

October 25, 2017

Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No