

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

CM-1953-CWP-2019 in/and
CWP-16769-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.7.2019

Ravi Shankar

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.Sushil Jain, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Sonu Jain, Advocate for
Mr.HS Oberoi, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr.Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.2

Mr.Ashish Kapoor, Advocate for respondent Nos. 3 and 4

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

CM-1953-CWP-2019

For the reasons enumerated in the application, the same is allowed and Annexures P-11 to P-18 are taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CWP-16769-2018

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of direction to respondent No.2 – Deputy Commissioner, Jind to take appropriate action regarding issuance of 'No Objection Certificate' for commissioning of retail outlet dealership in favour of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that at this stage, he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No. 2- Deputy Commissioner, Jind to consider and decide the application dated 26.12.2016 (Annexure P-2) sent by respondent Nos.3 and 4 expeditiously.

Learned State counsel submits that he is not averse to the suggestion put forth by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2- Deputy Commissioner, Jind to consider and decide the application dated 26.12.2016 (Annexure P-2) sent by respondent Nos.3 and 4, after giving opportunity of hearing to the parties, in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within eight weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of eight weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

15.7.2019
gsv

[JITENDRA CHAUHAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No