

Gulshan Kumar

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Kumar Yadav, Advocate for
Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has paid money to respondents No. 5 to 9 for getting sanctioned the CC limit of 4.62 crores. But, the CC limit was not ultimately sanctioned and, thus, respondent No. 5 executed a writing in favour of the petitioner that he would refund the money received. An affidavit dated 04.07.2018 has also been sworn by him. Now, the private respondents are threatening the petitioner to return the aforementioned documents. A representation dated 21.07.2018 (Annexure P-4), has been submitted but no action has been taken thereupon till date.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 4 only.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4. Let five copies of the petition be supplied to him during the course of the day.

Considering the nature of the order being passed, there is no necessity to issue notice to respondents No. 5 to 9.

The petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No. 2 to objectively consider the representation dated 21.07.2018 (Annexure P-4) and to

take appropriate action thereupon in accordance with law, in case it is so felt

necessary, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

November 21, 2018
reena

[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE

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