

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

**CWP-12967-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 22.07.2021**

RAJESH KUMAR
Versus

..... Petitioner(s)

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. GPS Bal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondent no.1.

Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate
for respondent no.2 to 4.

LISA GILL, J.

This matter is being taken up for hearing through video conferencing due to outbreak of pandemic, COVID-19.

CM-9140-CWP-2021

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is supported by an affidavit of the applicant, same is allowed as prayed for. Document Annexure A-1 annexed along with the application, is taken on record, subject to just exceptions.

Application is disposed of.

CWP-12967-2021

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of impugned notice dated 15.04.2019 (Annexure P12) wherein petitioner has been asked to deposit Rs.60,912/- being 1/5th share of the bill amount pertaining to the electric connection of M/s. Mittal Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factory, Uklana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not liable to deposit said amount as factory in question was being run by Mr. Ram Dev Mittal, which was shut down by him and another electric meter was obtained by Ram Dev Mittal in the name of his son, Neeraj Mittal. Adjustment of the amount in question qua the domestic meter of Chandgi Ram, father of petitioner, who had passed away in the year 1995, it is submitted is unjustified and in fact illegal. Learned counsel further submits that representation dated 22.10.2020 had been submitted but to no avail.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner restricts his prayer for a decision on his representation by the competent authority, in a time bound manner.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A.G., Haryana, to whom an advance copy of writ petition has been supplied, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1. Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.2 to 4. He does not raise any serious objection to the limited prayer addressed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of this case, but without any expression of opinion on the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction that present writ petition be treated to be a comprehensive representation on behalf of petitioner and competent authority shall decide by passing a speaking order in accordance with law within a period of two months.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

(Lisa Gill)
Judge

22.07.2021

Sunil

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No