

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

(116)

CWP-27421-2016

Decided on: January 09, 2017.

Naib Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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

The petitioner, through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeks a direction to respondents No. 1 to 6 to take action against private respondent No.7, which is a Marriage Palace being run in Ambala City, as respondent No.7 had not provided the facilities as promised and has not given the balance receipt for Rs.60,500/-. The petitioner claims that a direction be given for consideration of the legal notice Annexure P-3 sent to the official respondents.

I have considered the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner.

On account of there being debatable issue whether the petitioner has got an enforceable right against the official respondents No.1 to 6, I do not deem it appropriate to issue any direction but since the claim of the petitioner is basically against respondent No.7 for having not performed the contractual obligations pursuant to the agreement Annexure P-1, it will be appropriate for the petitioner to avail the alternative remedy

available to him by approaching the forum with competent jurisdiction as the grievance of the petitioner of deficiency in service by respondent No.7 cannot be adjudicated by this Court.

This petition is disposed of as not maintainable without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

January 09, 2017

harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No