

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-20648-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.08.2019

Kuldeep Kumar Verma

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. S.L. Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

Challenge in the instant petition is to the order dated 14.6.2019 passed by the Regional Transport Authority, Patiala at Annexure P-2 and in terms of which the registration number PB-11-BH-0051 which had been allotted to a Skoda Octavia car of the petitioner has been canceled.

Counsel would submit that the action of the Regional Transport Authority, Patiala is arbitrary and cannot sustain as a sum of Rs.35,000/- had been paid by the petitioner to his counsel at the stage of allotment and assigning of the registration number. Further submitted that the allotment of the registration number in question relates back to the year 2014 and after a period of 5 years the cancellation vide impugned order is an action which is highly belated.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner at length and having perused the pleadings on record, this Court is of the considered view that the instant petition is completely bereft of merits and deserves to be dismissed.

Perusal of the impugned order would itself reveal the basis of cancellation of the registration number. There is a reference to a Punjab Govt. Notification dated 9.1.2014 and as per which the requisite fee of Rs.1

lakh had to be deposited so as to become eligible to be assigned the number in question. In other words it was a paid number. The petitioner had in fact deposited only Rs.3,000/-. Such factual premise is not even disputed by the counsel.

The amount of Rs.35,000/- alleged to be paid by the petitioner to his counsel would be of no consequence.

Even if the registration number in question had been assigned to the petitioner in the year 2014 and he having enjoyed of the use thereof for a period of 5 years, no vested right had accrued to him and particularly when such allotment was in clear violation of the relevant notification which held the field.

As a matter of last resort counsel has also adverted to a notification dated 30.9.2015 (Annexure P-3) which has been issued in supersession of the previous notification dated 9.1.2014. Counsel submits that as per such notification the requirement is to deposit the reserve fee of Rs.25,000/-. Even such submission is being noticed only to be rejected. Concededly the petitioner had only deposited a sum of Rs.3,000/- with the competent authority under the Department of Transport. The registration number had been assigned in the year 2014. The subsequent notification dated 30.9.2015 (Annexure P-3) would not have any retrospective effect and which also does not advance the case of the petitioner.

No infirmity in the impugned order has been found.

No merit, petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

29.08.2019

lucky

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