

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

206

CWP-15688-2022

Date of Decision : 18.12.2023

Payal Rani

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Sahil Menhdiratta, Advocate
Mr. Sushant Kareer, Advocate
Mr.Abhijeet Singh Rawaley, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communications dated 11.06.2021 (Annexure P-6) and 25.08.2021 (Annexure P-8) whereby PWD B&R Branch, Rohtak has raised objection with respect to installation of retail outlet.

2. From the perusal of impugned communications dated 11.06.2021 (Annexure P-6) and 25.08.2021 (Annexure P-8), it comes out that these communications are recommendations by PWD B&R Branch to District Magistrate, Rohtak. The respondent No.3-IOC in terms of Rule 144 of Petroleum Rules, 2002 has applied for NOC. The District Magistrate has

sought opinion of different departments including PWD B&R. The office of PWD B&R has pointed out objection to the District Magistrate, Rohtak. It is District Magistrate who has to adjudicate application seeking NOC in terms of Rule 144 of Petroleum Rules, 2002 and as on day, no order has been passed by the District Magistrate.

3. Faced with this, learned State counsel assures the Court that the District Magistrate would pass an appropriate order within three months from today after granting opportunity to IOC as well as petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees with the aforesaid arrangement.

5. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of.

18.12.2023
anju

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>