

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

CWP No.25346 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision:20.02.2017

Dayawati

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Surinder Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

Apparently, this Court is of the view that the controversy involved in the present writ petition would require detailed evidence being mixed question of fact and law as there is a specific allegation of impersonation and forgery at the behest of the petitioner against the private respondents and as well as official respondents qua her name being used by others for obtaining a license for running the brick kiln and in this regard, a representation dated 06.06.2016 (Annexure P-16) has been made.

Before I could delve upon the merits and de-merits of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he will be satisfied if direction is issued to respondent No.4 for taking appropriate action on the representation dated 06.06.2016 (Annexures P-16) within a stipulated period.

Without going into the merits and demerits of the matter, I direct respondent No.4 to consider the representation dated 06.06.2016 (Annexure P-16) served upon him by the petitioner and pass a speaking order thereon, in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The writ petition stands disposed of with the above direction.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

February 20, 2017
savita

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