

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-24478-2022
Date of decision : 20.02.2023

Parmil Kumar Kalani

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Peeush Gagneja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Rohit Ahuja, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Kamaldeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent no.3.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

This is a civil writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent no.1 to release the amount of honorarium of petitioner regarding which a representation dated 19.09.2022 (Annexure P-5) has been submitted by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances mentioned in the present petition, the petitioner has given a representation dated 19.09.2022 (Annexure P-5) to respondent no.3- Municipal Corporation, Abohar and has prayed that the decision regarding the same be taken in a time bound manner and in case any money is found due to the petitioner, the same be released within a specific time frame.

Learned counsel for respondent no.3 has submitted that the

representation dated 19.09.2022 (Annexure P-5) would be decided by respondent no.3 within a period of one month from today and in case any money is found due, then the same would be paid to the petitioner within a period of three months and necessary action in pursuance thereof would be taken within a period of three months from the said decision.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.3 to decide the representation dated 19.09.2022 (Annexure P-5) within a period of one month from today and if any amount is found due to the petitioner, then the same be released to the petitioner within a period of three months thereof.

It is made clear that in case the claim or any part thereof of the petitioner is to be rejected, then a speaking order with regard to the same be passed.

It is further made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent no.3 would decide the representation independently on its merit, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

February 20, 2023
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No