

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-25944-2023

Date of decision : 20.11.2023

Dalveer Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Regional Transport Authority, Bathinda

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr.P.S. Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ferry Sofat, Addl.A.G. Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for directing the respondent to approve a regular joint time table for Mansa to Miaan via Dulowal, Uddat, Birewala route.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has already given a legal notice but would submit a fresh legal notice by giving full and better particulars to the respondent and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the respondent considers the said fresh legal notice in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the respondent would consider the fresh legal notice and decide the same within a period of 4 weeks from the date of the receipt of the fresh legal notice.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent to consider the fresh legal notice 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 the said fresh legal notice and in case, after considering the same, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea raised by 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 the said fresh legal notice.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the respondent would consider and decide the legal notice independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

November 20, 2023.
Davinder Kumar

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