

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

**C.W.P. No.7565 of 2016 (O&M)
Decided on : 24.08.2017**

Khadi Ashram

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI**

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Senior Panel Counsel,
for UOI.

Mr. Sandeep Suri, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3.

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondent has placed on record information as also a certificate in favour of the petitioner granting “Khadi Mark Certificate”.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Looking at the nature of the prayer made and the material placed before us, we deem it appropriate to observe that the claim of the petitioner is satisfied as no surviving cause remains leaving the issue noticed in the order dated 26.4.2016 extracted hereinbelow to be debated if occasion arises in some other case : -

“*Inter alia* contends that Section 28 of the Khadi Village

and Industry Commission Act, 1956 prescribes that every rule and every regulation made under this Act shall be laid, as soon as may be after it is made, before each House of Parliament, while it is in session, for a total period of thirty days which may be comprised in one session or more, but the regulations prescribing the Khadi Mark as a mandatory condition has been prescribed in violations of the provisions of Section 28 as even though it was laid before the Lok Sabha but was not laid before the Rajya Sabha as per the mandate of Section 28 of the Act.

Notice of motion for 25.7.2016.”

Disposed of as having satisfied.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

August 24, 2017

Paritosh Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No