

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 9296 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision:- 18.12.2020

Savita Rani and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE.**

Present:- Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Pankaj Gupta, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab,
for the respondents.

(The aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in virtual Court).

* * * *

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed this petition for quashing the impugned letter dated 26.06.2020 (Annexure P-9) passed by respondent No.4 whereby a penalty of Rs. 7,00,000/- has been imposed upon the petitioner for non-depositing the monthly installments of the parking allotment fee etc.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that to redress their grievances, the petitioners have already filed a representation before the respondent authorities but no decision thereon has been taken as yet as admitted by the respondents in their reply.

Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent-State of Punjab submits that the authorities will look into the matter and the aforesaid representation filed by the petitioners shall be considered and decided within a period of four weeks in accordance with law and the order would be communicated to the petitioners.

In view of the aforesaid statement made by learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, the petition stands disposed of with a direction to the respondent-authorities to look into the matter and decide the representation filed by the petitioners within a period of four weeks in accordance with law and thereafter communicate the order that shall be passed to the petitioners. However, the interim order dated 06.07.2020 passed by a coordinate Bench shall continue to operate till such decision is

It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and therefore, the respondent-authorities would be at liberty to examine the matter keeping all facts and facets into consideration and thereafter accept or reject the same in accordance with law.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

18.12.2020
ndj

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No