

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

Sr. No.103

CWP No. 21269 of 2020

DATE OF DECISION: December 10, 2020

BALWINDER RAI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Jastej Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Lavanya Paul, AAG, Punjab,
for respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Advocate for
Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is aggrieved because respondent No.4 concealed the factum of his blacklisting for obtaining allotment of tender work. For redressal of his grievance, he had approached the concerned authorities by way of filing of statutory appeal. The first appeal was rejected but the second appeal has been allowed vide order dated 15.10.2020. Re-tendering has been ordered.

This writ petition has been filed for directions to the official respondents not to make payment for the work done by respondent No.4 by concealing his blacklisting. A legal notice dated 30.11.2020 (Annexure P-5) has also been issued.

In my considered opinion, the writ petition is premature. Only 10 days have elapsed since the date of the legal notice dated 30.11.2020 (Annexure P-5). The concerned authorities have to be given adequate time to respond.

The writ petition is thus, dismissed as premature.

December 10, 2020
Ankur

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No