

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

(114)

CWP-20914-2023

Date of decision: - 20.09.2023

Manjeet Singh Mann

....Petitioner

Versus**State of Punjab and others**

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Manpreet Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus for directing the respondent department for giving permanent time to the petitioner's bus in the Time Table dated 23.08.2022 (Annexure P-1) and revised time table dated 21.09.2022 (Annexure P-2).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievance of the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 28.05.2023 (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.3 and he would be satisfied in case respondent No.3 considers the same in accordance with law, within a time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grants him the appropriate relief.
3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent No.3

would consider the representation dated 28.05.2023 (Annexure P-5), in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of four weeks from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to consider the representation dated 28.05.2023 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case respondent No.3 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case the competent authority is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of four weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

September 20, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No