

224

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

ARB No. 106 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.09.2022

M/s Luxmi Rice Mill and others

-Petitioners

Versus

District Manager, HAFED and another

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Japsehaj Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Prateek Mahajan, Advocate, and
Ms. Perna Malhotra, Advocate,
for the respondents.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Perusal of record would show that agreement attached with this case relates to petitioner No.6 only.

Learned counsel for the respondents has taken a specific objection with regard to number of agreements executed vis-a-vis different petitioners other than petitioner No.6 with the respondents. State of Haryana has not been impleaded with whom the agreement was executed by petitioners No.1,2,7 and 8.

Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that even qua the work done by petitioner No.6, payment has been released in favour of petitioners No.3 to 6, details of which have been given in para no.5 of the written statement wherein claim of petitioner No.6- M/s R.M. Trading company figures at serial no.4 of the tabulated data. After demand of final bill on completion of work on 12.07.2010, no objection or claim was made by petitioner No.6 at a subsequent stage. Filing of petition in the year 2018 is patently time barred.

No replication has been filed.

Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that in view of replication filed by the petitioner in earlier writ petition i.e. CWP No.21753 of 2013, the contract had already expired between the parties in the year 2010, when the last payment was made on 12.07.2010.

For the reasons recorded hereinabove, no indulgence can be granted in favour of the petitioners.

Dismissed.

07.09.2022

Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes/No |