

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

**CWP-31687-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:01.11.2019**

Karambir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & others

... Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner raises an innocuous prayer for directing the first respondent i.e. the Union of India impleaded through Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation, New Delhi to take a decision on the representation dated NIL appended as Anenxure P-1 along with the writ petition.

Counsel has been heard and the representation at Annexure P-1 has been perused.

Apparently, petitioner runs a taxi. His grievance is that Shri Guru Ramdas International Airport Taxi Stand Association is not permitting him to pick and drop passengers from the taxi stand of the International Airport, Amritsar.

During the course of arguments, it stands conceded that the afore noticed Taxi Stand Association has been granted the work of managing the taxi services at the International Airport at Amritsar.

The contract that has been entered into between the International Airport Taxi Stand Association as also the respondent/ authorities has not been placed on record. Acceptance of the prayer of the

petitioner for him to be permitted to ply his taxi within the premises of the International Airport may be conflict with the terms and conditions of the contract entered into between the International Airport Taxi Stand Association and the concerned authorities under the Ministry of Civil Aviation. In any event, in the absence of such document of contract having been placed on record, no directions can be issued to the first respondent to examine the grievance of the petitioner.

That apart, the instant petition is bad for non-joinder of proper parties. Even though, the representation at Annexure P-1 raises specific allegations against the members of the International Airport Taxi Stand Association, yet such Association has not been impleaded and arrayed as a party respondent.

In view of the above, no interference is called for.

Petition is dismissed.

01.11.2019*harjeet***(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |