

accordance with law. He has further submitted that notice was given to the petitioner for the reason that she started construction without getting the necessary approval from respondent No.4-Municipal Council, Nangal.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is apparent that respondent No.4-Municipal Council earlier had granted approval to the petitioner for raising the boundary wall, however, thereafter, for construction of the godown the necessary approval as prayed for by the petitioner was to be granted in accordance with law for which the petitioner did not submit the requisite documents. However, counsel for respondent No.4 has fairly submitted that if the petitioner submits the documents which are required for the approval, the same would be dealt with by Municipal Council-Respondent No.4 in accordance with law. Besides this, it is further stated that if the petitioner has raised any constructions, which is in violation of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911, respondent No.4-Municipal Council would be at liberty to deal with the same in accordance with law.

Resultantly, the present petition is disposed of and the impugned order dated 12.11.2012 is set aside. The petitioner is at liberty to file the application alongwith the documents as required by respondent No.4 for proceeding with the case for grant of necessary approval within two weeks from today and respondent no.4 would deal with the same and decide it expeditiously in accordance with law within a period of one month thereafter.

13.09.2023
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No