

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

Sr. No.103

Civil Writ Petition No.6162 of 2022

Date of Decision : March 25, 2022

Dinesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Atul Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

The grievance of the petitioner is that despite representation made to respondent No.3, LOI in favour of respondent No.10 has not been withdrawn. According to the petitioner, a high-tension line is passing over the land offered by respondent No.10 and thus, the said land is not suitable for establishing a retail outlet as per the guidelines issued by the Union of India.

A legal notice dated 12.02.2022 (Annexure P-7) has also been issued but the same has not been responded to.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 5 only.

Mr. Ankur Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and waives service.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 to 5 and waives service.

Considering the nature of the order being passed, no reply is necessary.

March 25, 2022

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No