

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

221

CWP-17942-2018
Date of Decision: 18.05.2023

PARVEEN SHARMA

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Yagyaang Ajay, Advocate for
Mr. Kawaljyot Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Niharika Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

None for respondents No.2 to 4.

Mr. R.S. Khosla, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Bharti Pujara, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed for seeking issuance of directions to respondents No.2 to 4 i.e. the private builders to immediately restore the water connection of the petitioner which is claimed to have been illegally disconnected and not restored despite the specific order passed by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Patiala.

A separate written statement had been filed on behalf of respondents No.2 to 4 as per which the petitioner was served with the demand notice dated 30.01.2018 raising a demand of Rs.34,200/- on account of IFMS charges, which were due against her since 28.03.2007. A further amount of Rs.75,234/- was shown to be outstanding as on 30.01.2018 and that the above said aspect and

about the petitioner herself being in default has been concealed. It was also averred that the petitioner had also filed a suit for Mandatory Injunction against the said respondents for the same very relief. An application under Section 151 C.P.C. for issuance of the said directions was also preferred. Vide order dated 24.09.2018, the said application was disposed of by directing the petitioner to make payment of 50% of the charges as per the demand notice dated 30.01.2018 and the respondents were directed to restore the water connection on fulfillment of the said condition. Yet another complaint bearing CC No.410 of 2018 had been preferred before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Patiala, which is also stated to be pending. Even though the abovesaid reply had been filed by respondents No.2 to 4 way back in November 2018, however, no rejoinder/replication controverting the same has been filed by the petitioner till date. It seems that the petitioner is filing multiple petitions/complaints, which is clearly an abuse of process of law.

I do not find any compelling reasons to entertain the present petition especially when the petitioner has already taken recourse to the alternative remedies including approaching the Civil Court.

Faced with the above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not want to pursue the present petition and seeks permission to withdraw the same.

Disposed of as withdrawn.

18.05.2023

rajender

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No