

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

CWP-20209-2020

Date of decision : 26.11.2020

Darshan Lal Chaudhary

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Vikas Mohan Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

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

RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the allotment of Sugar Handling Contract agreement dated 27.10.2020 (Annexure P-4) for the year 2020-2021 issued by respondent No.3 for the experience certificates submitted by the private respondent were not in order and also not in sync with the Policy floated by respondent No.2.

Further a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to reject the tenders submitted by respondent No.5 – Surinder Kumar for Sugar Handling Contract Agreement for the year 2020-21 has been sought.

The petitioner has directly approached this Court without filing representation before the authorities. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner would soon move a representation as regards his grievances and concern.

Learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, submits that in case a representation is filed by the petitioner, respondent No.2 - Punjab State Federation of Cooperation Sugar Mills shall consider and take a decision thereon within two weeks of filing of representation.

In view of the aforesaid statement made by learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, we do not find any reason to entertain the present petition, which is disposed of taking the statement of learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab, on record.

It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and, therefore, respondent No.2 would be at liberty to examine the matter keeping all the facts and facets into consideration and thereafter accept or reject the same in accordance with law.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

26.11.2020
ndj

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