

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

(110)

CWP-26738-2023

Date of decision: - 29.11.2023

**Anand Gulia and others****....Petitioners****Versus****The State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Rohit Kapoor, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 to 5 to restrain respondents No.6 and 7 and their subordinate staff from plying the buses of Haryana Roadways from separate counters at bus stands Jhajjar and Rohtak, which as per the case of the petitioners, have been illegally set up being in violation of the time-table framed/approved by respondent No.3.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners in the present petition, a detailed representation dated 18.07.2023 (Annexure P-5) has been given to respondents No.3 and 4, who are the respective Secretaries, Regional Transport Authorities, Jhajjar and Rohtak and would be satisfied, at this stage, in case the said two authorities are directed to consider the said representation and take appropriate action in accordance with law.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that since in the present case an opportunity of hearing is also required to be granted to the representatives of respondents No.6 and 7, against whom the action is sought, thus, respondents No.3 and 4 be granted six weeks time for considering the representation and for passing a speaking order thereon.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.3 and 4 to consider the representation dated 18.07.2023 (P-5) filed by the petitioners within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case respondents No.3 and 4 are of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioners as expeditiously as possible. In case respondents No.3 and 4 are of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of six weeks.

5. It is made clear that before any order is passed, all the concerned persons including the petitioners and respondents No.6 and 7 be given an opportunity of personal hearing by respondents No.3 and 4.

6. It is also made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondents No.3 and 4 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

**November 29, 2023**  
naresh.k

**( VIKAS BAHL )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No