

112

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

CWP-16509-2023

Date of decision: 02.08.2023

Avtar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

The State Transport Commissioner, Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Raj Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Addl. A.G. Punjab, for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to release the stage carriage permit granted in response to the grant letter bearing No.34 dated 10.04.2023 for the grant of stage carriage permit on the route Daulatpura to Bathinda via Gill Khurd Chak Bakhtu-Chak Fateh Singh Wala-Laverisar Adesh Medical College-Bhucho Khurd (Annexure P-2), issued by respondent No.2 after completion of required legal formalities under the provisions of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a representation dated 04.07.2023 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the said respondent No.2

is directed to consider the said representation dated 04.07.2023 (Annexure P-5) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief as expeditiously as possible.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the representation dated 04.07.2023 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 04.07.2023 (Annexure P-5) within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then respondent No.2 would grant appropriate relief, in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and in case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not found to be meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of three weeks from today.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

02.08.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No****Whether reportable:- Yes/No**