

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

105

CWP-3219-2020

Date of Decision:29.08.2022

Sukhpal Singh Contractor

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

**Present: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Girdhar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

Ms. Niharika Sharma, A.A.G., Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ , J.(Oral)

Prayer in the instant civil writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the due payment of ₹4,50,000/- qua the work of providing and installing reverse OSMOSIS(RO) plant at New Water Works in Village Burj Sidhwan Guru Ghar, Block Malout (under PIDB Funding Head), executed by the petitioner along with interest @ 12% per annum.

Pursuant to the directions issued by this Court, short reply by way of affidavit of Chamak Singla, Executive Engineer, Water Supply & Sanitation, Division Malout has been filed on behalf of the respondents today in the Court and the same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been handed over to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner.

The relevant extract of the said short affidavit reads as under:-

“5. That the respondent No.5 passed office order vide order no.215 dated 02.07.2020 vide which the claim of the petitioner was rejected due to non-submission of any type of bill regarding the above work allotted to the petitioner vide allotment letter no.392 dated 15.01.2016. The copy of the order passed by respondent No.5 is annexed herewith as Annexure(R-1).

6. There is nothing on record to show that any such original bill or bills ever submitted by the petitioner/contractor for the work alleged to have been done by him. If the bills have been submitted and had gone through the above stated process of grant of approval for release of funds, it is pertinent to mention here that the petitioner also did not annex any bill of the work alleged done by him with present petition.”

In view of the aforesaid stand adopted by the respondents that the bills had not been submitted by the petitioner, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not press the instant civil writ petition at this stage so as to approach the authorities by submission of bills in accordance with the provisions as enshrined in the contract.

Dismissed as not pressed.

August 29, 2022
seema

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No