

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-PIL No. 127 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of decision:- 27.09.2021

Nikhil Saraf

.....Petitioner

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. Nikhil Saraf-petitioner in person.
Mr. P.S.Bajwa, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Anil Mehta, Addl. Standing Counsel for U.T.
(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 alleging violation of the orders passed by the Supreme Court in *Abhay Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh 2013(15) SCC 435*, regarding use and installations of beacons on the rooftop of vehicles.

It is observed that the petitioner had previously filed a Civil Writ Petition by way of Public interest Litigation which was registered as CWP-PIL No.69 of 2021 (Nikhil Saraf v. State of Punjab and others), and the same was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 07.04.2021 with an observation that in case the petitioner files a representation before the respondent-authorities by giving particular instances of violation of the orders of the Supreme Court, the respondent-authorities would look into the same and take a decision thereon in accordance with law. The statements of the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the States of Punjab and Haryana as well as learned Senior Standing Counsel appearing for

Union Territory, Chandigarh were also taken on record to the effect that in case the petitioner does so, the respondent-authorities will look into the same.

From a perusal of the petition, it is clear that subsequent to the orders passed by this Court, the petitioner had filed a representation before the respondent-authorities on 05.07.2021. From a perusal of the same, it is evident that no particular instance of violation of the directions of the Supreme Court has been mentioned by the petitioner in the said representation.

When confronted with the aforesaid aspect, the petitioner appearing in person submits that he does not have any way and means to find out the particular instances regarding violation of the orders of the Supreme Court.

In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any reason to entertain the second petition for the same cause of action or reason. The petition filed by the petitioner is dismissed as no particular instance of violation has been pointed out either before the authorities or before this Court.

It is made clear that the observations made by this Court regarding pointing out of particular instances of violations etc. in the order dated 07.04.2021 passed in CWP-PIL No. 69 of 2021 would still be available to the petitioner.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

27.09.2021
ravinder

Whetherspeaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whetherreportable	Yes/No