

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

Date of decision: 28.08.2019

1. CWP No.2581 of 2016 (O&M)

NCC-BGR Consortium and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

.....Respondents

2. CWP No.7561 of 2016 (O&M)

NCC-BGR Consortium and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

.....Respondents

3. CWP No.20861 of 2016 (O&M)

Sainik-VPR Mining Consortium and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

.....Respondents

4. CWP No.25050 of 2016 (O&M)

EMTA Coal Ltd

.....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd.

.....Respondents

5. CWP No.12397 of 2016 (O&M)

M/s Thriveni Earthmovers Pvt Ltd and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHARMA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present: Mr. D.S. Patwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Bikramjit S Patwalia, Advocate for the petitioner(s) in
CWP Nos.2581 and 7561 of 2016.

Mr. Chetan Mittal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate for the petitioners in
CWP No.20861 of 2016 and for respondent No.3 in
CWP No.2581 of 2016.

Mr. Arjun Partap Atma Ram, Advocate for the petitioner(s) in
CWP No.25050 of 2016.

Mr. Puneet Bali, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Abhishek Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner(s) in
CWP No.12397 of 2016.

Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.4 in
CWP No.12397 of 2016.

Mr. Suveer Sheokand, Addl.AG, Punjab.

Mr. Atul Nanda, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Rameeza Hakeem, Advocate and
Mr. Vinod S Bhardwaj, Advocate for respondent-PSPCL.

RAJIV SHARMA,J

By means of this common order, we dispose of all the aforesaid five writ petitions since common questions of law and facts arise for consideration in all the petitions.

Sh. Atul Nanda, learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-PSPCL on the basis of instructions imparted to him by the Chief Engineer, PSPCL submits that the petitioners will be afforded opportunity of being heard qua the impugned orders.

Accordingly, we dispose of all the writ petitions with the direction that the representation shall be made by the petitioner(s) within a period of two weeks from today, which shall be decided within a period of two weeks

thereafter. The representation shall be decided by passing a speaking/detailed order after taking into consideration all the pleas raised by the petitioner(s) in their respective representations.

We make it clear that the time granted to move representations is imperative and mandatory and in case the needful is not done within the period specified, the impugned orders shall stand automatically revived. It is made clear by way of abundant precaution that once fresh orders are passed by the Competent Authority, the earlier impugned orders/ resolutions shall stand superseded automatically.

We place on record our appreciation for the fair stand adopted by Sh. Atul Nanda, Senior Advocate in the present lis.

(RAJIV SHARMA)
JUDGE

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

August 28, 2019
manoj

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No