

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

CWP-1307-2022

Date of decision : 27.01.2022

Anil Duggal

.....Petitioner

Versus

The Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research
(PGIMER), Chandigarh and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Rahul Sharma-I, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhishek Kumar Premi, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

(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 is aggrieved by the act of the respondents in opening and establishing another Chemist shop at Level 2, New OPD Block, PGIMER, Chandigarh, proposing to allot it to HLL Life Care Limited (respondent No.2) in the name of AMRIT Pharmacy & Generic Pharmacy Store.

It is submitted that the petitioner had applied and obtained allotment of the shop at Level 2, New OPD Block, PGIMER, Chandigarh, on the assumption and presumption that he will be the sole pharmacist on Level 2, but the act of respondent No.1 would seriously prejudice his business prospects. It is submitted that the petitioner had served a legal notice dated 07.12.2021 (Annexure P-5) upon respondent No.1, which is pending before the authorities and it is required to be

decided by the Director of respondent No.1 Institute or his nominee as per Clause 50 of the tender form dated 17.08.2021 (Annexure P-1).

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1, on advance copy, submits that the legal notice served by the petitioner would be considered and decided expeditiously and decision thereon would be communicated to the petitioner.

In view of the aforesaid statement made by learned counsel for respondent No.1, we do not find any reason to entertain the present petition which is disposed of taking his statement on record.

It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and, therefore, respondent No.1 would be at liberty to examine the matter keeping all facts and facets into consideration and thereafter accept or reject the same in accordance with law.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

January 27, 2022
ndj

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