

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

(110)

CWP-8375-2023

Date of decision: - 24.04.2023

Gurmeet Singh and others**....Petitioners****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Sukhvir Singh Sahu, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for respondents No.1 to 4.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondents No.2 to take up the revision petition filed by the petitioners against order dated 14.03.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No.3-Divisional Commissioner, Patiala, Division Patiala and to consider the same for preliminary hearing as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two weeks from today.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that a revision petition bearing ROR No.413 of 2023, alongwith stay application, has been listed for hearing on 28.04.2023. It is further submitted that at this stage, the petitioners are limiting their prayer for directing respondent No.2 to consider the said revision petition alongwith

the stay application within a period of two weeks from today.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that every endeavour would be respondent No.2 to take up the said revision petition bearing ROR No.413 of 2023, filed alongwith the stay application, on 28.04.2023 or within a period of two weeks therefrom for preliminary hearing and respondent No.2, after hearing the petitioners, would pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to take up the said ROR No.413 of 2023 for preliminary hearing, filed alongwith the stay application, on 28.04.2023 or within a period of two weeks therefrom and after hearing the petitioners, would pass appropriate orders on the revision petition and the stay application, in accordance with law.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider the matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 24, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No