

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-20588-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision : 02.12.2020

Surjit Rai and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI

Present: Mr. Ramandeep, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, DAG, Punjab.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN J. (ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing in the light of the pandemic COVID-19 situation and as per instructions.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a direction to respondent Nos.1 to 5, to cancel the Licence and Registration of respondent No.6, in terms of the provisions of the PAPRA Act, 1995, the latter having failed to provide basic amenities and carry out the development works in the colony, namely, Sehaj Enclave.

Learned counsel contends that at this stage, he would be satisfied, in case, a direction is issued to respondent No.2-Chief Administrator, Punjab Urban Planning and Development Authority, PUDA Bhawan, Sector 62, SAS Nagar, Mohali, to consider and decide legal notice

dated 20.08.2020 (Annexure P-5), in a time-bound manner.

Heard.

Considering the nature of prayer made, we are not inclined to issue notice of motion. A complete copy of the paper-book has already been supplied to learned State counsel.

Accordingly, without adverting to the merits of the case, respondent No.2- Chief Administrator, Punjab Urban Planning and Development Authority, PUDA Bhawan, Sector 62, SAS Nagar, Mohali is directed to consider and decide legal notice dated 20.08.2020 (Annexure P-5), as per law, expeditiously, preferably, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioners is admissible, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of four weeks thereafter, in accordance with law. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

Disposed of.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

(GIRISH AGNIHOTRI)
JUDGE

02.12.2020

atulsethi

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes

No

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No