

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

**CWP No. 22667 of 2016
Decided on : 08.05.2017**

Mawana Sugars Limited

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

PRESENT: Mr. Hemant Sarin, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of *Certiorari*, for quashing the Ordinance dated 15.06.2015 (Annexure P-1) and amendment to the Punjab Infrastructure (Development and Regulation) Act, 2002 (in short 'the Act'), vide notifications dated 24.06.2015 & 27.11.2015 (Annexure P-2 & P-3, respectively).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a representation dated 08th December, 2015 (Annexure P-4) has been filed, but no decision thereon has been taken so far. It was prayed that direction be issued to respondent No.1 to decide the said representation at the first instance. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that liberty be also granted to the petitioner to file a supplementary representation by raising all the pleas as have been sought to be raised in the present writ petition. It was also prayed by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner be permitted to approach this Court again, in case, the grievance of the petitioner is not redressed by the respondents.

averments made in the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition by allowing the petitioner to file a supplementary representation within a period of one month from today. In case such a supplementary representation is filed by the petitioner, then the representation Annexure P-4 as well as the supplementary representation shall be decided by respondent No.1, within a period of next two months, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and by passing a speaking order, in accordance with law.

4. Needless to say that it shall be open to the petitioner to take recourse to the remedies against the order(s) which may be passed by the authorities or to challenge the Ordinance and amendment to the Act, in accordance with law.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

May 08, 2017

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No