

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

CWP-3759-2021

Date of decision : 18.02.2021

Jagdeep Kumar Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Chetan Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India, with
Mr. Dheeraj Jain, Senior Panel Counsel, Union of India,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Amit Jhanji, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 to 4.

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

RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

The petitioner has filed this petition being aggrieved by the order dated 22.01.2021 (Annexure P-10) vide which the license for Shop No. 13 for Provision/Grocery Store, NSC, PGIMER, Chandigarh, has been terminated on account of non-deposit of the license fee.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is willing to give an undertaking before respondent No.2 authorities today itself to deposit the outstanding amount in instalments within a specific time and also to the effect that he shall continue to deposit the license

fee in future by 7th of each month.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 – PGIMER on advance copy submits that in case the petitioner files an undertaking today itself and deposits the outstanding amount with the respondent authorities as per his undertaking, the respondent No.2 authorities would re-consider the order cancelling/terminating his license and re-call the same, if so required.

In view of the statement of learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 – PGIMER, without entering into the merits of the case, the petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move an application along with an undertaking as well as copy of this order before the respondent No.2 – PGIMER with a further stipulation as per the statement of learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 – PGIMER that in case, the petitioner does so today itself, the respondent No.2 authorities shall consider the same and take a decision thereon including the decision to withdraw the impugned order re-calling/terminating the license of the petitioner and re-call the same, if so required in accordance with law.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

February 18, 2021
ndj

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