

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 502/2018 with CM. APPL. 2158/2018

M/S CHL LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravi Kant Chadha, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Mansi Chadha, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Suparna Srrivastava, CGSC with
Mr. Tushar Mathur, Advocate for R-1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **19.01.2018**

CM. APPL. 2158/2018

1.) Allowed subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 502/2018

2.) Issue notice. Ms. Suparna Srrivastava, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1.

3.) In view of the order that I propose to pass, for the moment, no notice need to be issued to respondent no. 2.

4.) There are several prayers made in the writ petition. Mr. Chadha, learned senior counsel, on instructions restricts his prayer to the consideration of the petitioner's review petition dated 27 October, 2017.

4.1) Mr. Chadha submits that in terms of prayer Clause(2), the petitioner should be heard in support of the review petition filed to meet the reasons for rejection of the petitioner's request for extension of Letter of Approval

(LOA) dated 5 October, 2017.

5.) Respondent no. 1 via letter dated 5 October, 2017 has rejected the request made by the petitioner for extension of letter of permission beyond 28th April, 2017 and upto 28th April, 2018 on two grounds: First, on account of petitioner's track record. Second, on account of the purported lack of "financial credibility" of the petitioner.

6.) Mr. Chadha also submits that these reasons are not sustainable and for this purpose he relies upon the averments made in the review petition dated 27 October, 2017.

7.) Given these circumstances, respondent No. 1 is directed to dispose of review petition dated 27 October, 2017. Respondent No. 1 will accord personal hearing to the petitioner's authorised representative. The petitioner will also be entitled to furnish relevant documents in support of its contentions. The respondent No. 1 will pass a speaking order. A copy of the order shall be furnished to the petitioner. In case, the petitioner, is aggrieved by the order passed by respondent No. 1, it will have liberty to assail the same, albeit, in accordance with law.

8.) Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 19, 2018/Nk