

2024:PHHC:019051

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(115)

CWP No. 2987 of 2024
Date of Decision : 12.02.2024

Rajpal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to approach the respondent-State so as to show that the order of punishment as well as order passed in appeal are incorrect as the licensing authority, Mathura had issued him a fresh license and not renewed the same, which fact makes all the difference and the same has been wrongly noticed in the impugned order.

Ordered accordingly.

Learned State counsel, Mr. Harish Nain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, submits that in case, any grievance is raised by the petitioner before the authorities concerned, the same will be looked into and appropriate order will be passed within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of any such grievance.

February 12th, 2024
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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