

101-3 cases

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

CWP-10881-2016

Date of Decision: December 18, 2023

Satpal and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Mohit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms.Akshita Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr.J.S.Toor, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

Petitioners have approached this Court praying for quashing of Notice, dated 25.02.2016 and letter, dated 02.11.2010, Annexures P-5 and P-4, respectively, whereby the petitioners were directed to pay the rent for the shops which have been purchased by them in the year 1999 and for issuance of direction to the respondents to abide by the terms of the agreement entered in between the parties in the year 1999.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted before this Court that during pendency of this petition, the new Act, namely, Punjab Management and Transfer of Municipal Property Act, 2020, has come in operation and case of the petitioners should be considered under the same Act.

Learned counsel for the respondent-MC inter alia has submitted

that though this case has a checkered history and went upto the Hon’ble Apex Court as well, however, he submits that if the petitioners file a fresh representation, mentioning all the grounds available to them, to be considered under the New Act, the same would be considered in accordance with law.

In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the MC, the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to file a fresh representation before Executive Officer/respondent No.2-MC, for redressal of their grievances within two weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and in case the representation is filed, respondent No.2 is directed to decide the same in accordance with law by passing a speaking order, within four weeks from the date of its receipt. It is further directed that the order passed by respondent No.2 be communicated to the petitioners as well.

However, the petitioners would be at liberty to pursue their remedies in case any further cause of action accrues to them.

December 18, 2023

meenuss

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned ?
- 2. Whether reportable ?

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No