

116

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

CWP-23129-2023

Date of decision: 12.10.2023

Inderjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

The State Transport Commissioner, Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Abhikant Vats, Advocate and
Mr. Raj Kumar Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Lekh Raj Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Addl. A.G. Punjab
for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to transfer the bus No.PB-03AF-6834 and remove/delete the same from the permit, enabling the petitioner to introduce another bus and operate his permit which is valid upto 15.03.2027.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given legal notice dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P-1) to respondent No.2 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the said respondent No.2 is

directed to consider the said legal notice dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P-1) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said legal notice dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P-1) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to consider legal notice dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P-1) in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then respondent No.2 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

12.10.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:-****Yes/No****Whether reportable:-****Yes/No**