

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122

CWP-26398-2023

Date of decision: 24.11.2023

PARAMJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

THE PUNJAB STATE WAREHOUSING CORPORATION,
CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present:- Mr. Tahaf Bains, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present writ petition has been filed for seeking issuance of directions to the respondent-Corporation to decide the review petition dated 08.11.2023 (Annexure P-3) pending before the respondent No.3 against the order dated 17.10.2023 passed by the respondent No.2 upholding the punishment order dated 22.06.2023/30.06.2023 vide which recovery of Rs. 1,89,145/- has been imposed upon the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the respondents are effecting recovery notwithstanding that the review petition is already pending consideration with the respondent-authorities and that similar controversy had earlier been brought before this Court in series of writ petitions including ***CWP-16252-2023*** titled ***“Jarmal Singh and another versus The Reviewing Authority and others”*** which is decided vide order dated

31.07.2023. The review petition was disposed of with directions to the reviewing authority to consider and decide the review petition in accordance with law in a time bound manner and that the recovery has been ordered to remain stayed and to be subject to the final order that may be passed by the Appellate Authority. He contends that the case of the petitioner is identical to the case of *Jarmal Singh (Supra)*, hence, the respondent-authorities ought to refrain from effecting recovery from the petitioner during the pendency of the writ petition.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G. Punjab, who would otherwise be on the panel of the Boards, Corporation and other statutory bodies of the State of Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. A copy of the petition has been handed over to him. He has gone through the order dated 31.07.2023 passed in *CWP-16252-2023* titled “*Jarmal Singh and another versus The Reviewing Authority and others*” and fairly submits that the controversy involved in the present writ petition is identical to that decided CWP-16252-2023 vide the above order.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of in terms of the order dated 31.07.2023 passed in *CWP-16252-2023* titled “*Jarmal Singh and another versus The Reviewing Authority and others*”.

The writ petition is disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 24, 2023

Vishal sharma

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