

136

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

CWP No. 10759 of 2022

Date of Decision: 19.05.2022

M/s Anmol Rice Mills and others

-Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh-I, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Petitioners have preferred this petition for the issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No.1 to 3 to provide police protection to the petitioners and their employees for the performance of handling and transportation of trucks hired by the petitioner at the rice mills at village Sailbrah, Bhairupa, Gumti Kalan, Chotian, Tehsil Rampura Phul, District Bathinda on the ground that petitioners have been threatened by respondents No.4 and 5 and other members of Truck Union and Chhilka Labour Union of Raman Mandi to hire their services only, whereas the petitioners have their own arrangement for the transportation of paddy, rice and other foodgrains.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that earlier also, similar controversy came up before this Court for consideration in **CWP No.6019 of 2008** titled **'M/s Kissan Cold Storage and others vs State of Punjab and others'** decided on 22.04.2008 and **CWP No.1498 of 2008** titled **'Amardeep Cold Storage vs State of Punjab and others'** decided on 22.04.2008 and necessary protection was granted. In **CWP No.192 of 2013** titled **'M/s Shree Ganpati Traders vs State of Punjab and others'**, an order was passed on 09.01.2013 directing the police to act in aid of the petitioners therein and provide police protection to facilitate conduct of their lawful business activities without hindrance from any third party.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that precisely for the grievance in question, representation dated 11.03.2022 is pending before respondent No.2 and at this stage, petitioners would be satisfied in case their representation is directed to be decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in accordance with law.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Aakanksha, A.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of calling upon any response from

the respondents at this stage, as no order prejudicial to the interest of any party is being passed.

This writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to take note of pending representation filed by the petitioners and pass appropriate order in accordance with law keeping in view the earlier precedents on the subject issue, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Petitioners would also be entitled to bring earlier orders passed by the High Court to the notice of respondent No.2.

19.05.2022

Jyoti Sharma

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

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