

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-23513-2023

Date of decision : 17.10.2023

Ravinder Singh Dhillon

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr.Harpinder Singh Jalal, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr.Kunal Muthreja, AAG, Punjab
for the respondents.**VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)**

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent no.3 to decide the representation dated 23.06.2023 (Annexure P-3) and issue the permit on the route in question as per the grant letter dated 29.03.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 23.06.2023 (Annexure P-3) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case respondent no.3 considers the same in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent no.3 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period

of 4 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present 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 23.06.2023 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 4 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea of the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 4 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

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 representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

October 17, 2023.
Davinder Kumar

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