

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

**LPA No.1303 of 2016 (O&M) in
CWP No.13411 of 1992
Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

Bikram Singh and others

..... Appellants

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL**

Present: Mr. Karanvir Singh Khehar, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Suveer Sheokand, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Athar Ahmed, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

RAJESH BINDAL J.

The order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 25.05.2016 has been challenged by filing the present intra-court appeal.

It has been noticed in the impugned order that the writ petition was filed at the stage when the legal notice served by the appellant was not responded to by the Punjab State Agricultural Marketing Board. The writ petition was disposed of by the learned Single Judge with a direction to the authorities to dispose of the legal notice by passing a speaking order after affording opportunity of personal hearing wherever requested. The appellants were also given liberty to challenge the same in case the decision was adverse to their interests.

Even at the time of issuance of notice of motion in the appeal, a grievance was raised that the appellants have not been communicated any order on their legal notice despite direction by the learned Single Judge.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 submitted that legal notice issued on behalf of the appellants has been decided and the order passed thereupon by the Competent Authority on 31.08.2016 was also endorsed to all the affected parties on 06.09.2016. He further submitted that vide the aforesaid order, the claim of the appellants, except one namely Avtar Singh, appellant No.8, was not found to be tenable, hence rejected. This fact is disputed by learned counsel for the appellants.

Be that as it may, a copy of the aforesaid order has been supplied by learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 to learned counsel for the appellants.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the present appeal is disposed of giving liberty to the appellants, except appellant No.8, whose claim was found to be tenable, to avail of their appropriate remedy against the order passed.

**(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

07.05.2018
rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No