

113

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

CWP-26969-2023

Date of decision: 01.12.2023

M/s Katra Motors Regd.

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Raj Kaushik, 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 certiorari/mandamus for quashing the letter/order dated 17.10.2023 (Annexure P-9) issued by respondent No.4. Further prayer has been made for directing the competent authority/respondent No.3 to grant and issue the timings in the joint time table to operate on the allotted valid route.

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 detailed legal notice dated 04.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) to respondent Nos.2 and 3 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 04.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) 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 in the present case, there are other parties who have to be heard before any decision is taken by the competent authority and thus, submits that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 04.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider legal notice dated 04.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed as expeditiously as possible and the same would be done after hearing all the concerned parties.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

01.12.2023

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No