

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(269)

CWP-23033-2022

Date of decision: - 31.07.2023

M/s Doaba Roadways Ltd.

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

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

Ms. Anju Sharma Kaushik, DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent No.3 to grant and release the timings in the joint name table for operation of the valid permits held by the petitioner Company with respect to route Hoshiarpur to Jalandhar and back, issued on 22.09.2022 (Annexure P-15).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to respondent No.3 and the petitioner would be satisfied, at this stage, in case respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said representation in a time bound manner and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, to grant the necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said representation within a period of three weeks from the date the representation of the petitioner is received by respondent No.3.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to consider the representation, if filed by the petitioner, within a period of three weeks from the date of the said representation is submitted by the petitioner and after considering the same, in case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted in accordance with law. In case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim of the petitioner be passed within a period of three weeks from the date of filing of representation by the petitioner.

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

July 31, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No