IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

205 **CWP No.19809-2018**
Date of Decision: February 11, 2019

Saral-Sugam Sewa Society .....Petitioner(s)

versus

State of Punjab and others .....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

***

Present: Mr. Kashish Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Mohan Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 5.

Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate
for respondent Nos.3 and 4.

Mr. Ishrat Phulka, Advocate
for respondent No. 6.

***

JITENDRA CHAUHAN , J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed for quashing the work order dated 27.07.2018 (Annexure P-3) passed by Corporation Engineer (HQ) Municipal Corporation Patiala, whereby the work of operation and maintenance of public toilets in Patiala city has been awarded to respondent No.6, without terminating an earlier, valid, contract in favour of the petitioner society.

Learned counsel for respondent Nos.3 and 4 prays for time to verify the assertion raised by learned counsel for the petitioner to the extent that work earlier allotted to it has been allotted to someone else. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.3 & 4 further states that matter is likely to be settled, in case,

SONIA ARORA
2019.02.15 11:17
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court Chandigarh

***

deficiencies as reflected in the order are removed. He further states that the petitioner was issued show-cause notice whereby he was directed to appear before respondent No.3 on 08.02.2019. However, the petitioner did not appear.

Heard.

In view of the above, the Court feels that the petitioner be given another opportunity to make his submissions before the Competent Authority.

Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to again appear on 05.03.2019 before respondent No.3 at 11:00 a.m. or any other date convenient to respondent No.3, who will consider the claim of the petitioner and pass appropriate order within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by it is admissible, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to it, within a period of six 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.

Disposed of.

In the meantime, the work allotted to him be not allotted to anybody else.

February 11, 2019 **[JITENDRA CHAUHAN]**
sonia arora **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether Reportable : No

SONIA ARORA
2019.02.15 11:17
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
High Court Chandigarh