



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

218-2

CWP-15496-2020

Date of decision: 09.05.2024

KAWAL SIMRAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A,S. Manaise, Advocate
for respondents No.3 and 4.

Mr. Vishal Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present writ petition is for seeking issuance of directions to respondent No.3-Municipal Corporation, Amritsar to implement its order dated 15.05.2019 whereby the permission for installation of telecom tower has been revoked.
2. Counsel for the respondent No.3 contends that the said tower is dysfunctional but he is not in a position to give any satisfactory response as to why the tower could not be dislocated/removed once the permission for installation of the said tower had already been revoked by the Municipal Corporation, Amritsar, vide its order dated



CWP-15496-2020

-2-

15.05.2019.

3. Counsel for contesting respondent No.5-M/s Bharti Airtel Ltd. contends that even though the permission has been revoked, the decision of the Municipal Corporation, Amritsar is not based on correct appreciation of the regulations. He submits that they have already preferred an appeal before the District Judge as per the regulations and the said appeal is still pending. He fairly concedes that there is no stay against the impugned order directing removal of the said mobile tower. He submits that the respondent-Company be granted a period of three months for removal of the said tower subject to any interim stay being granted by the Court and/or the appeal being allowed.

4. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.3 and 4 submits that they will take all the necessary steps for ensuring removal of the tower in question.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the aforesaid statements made by the counsel for the respondents, he has no further subsisting grievance.

6. In view of the statement made by counsel for respondents, the present writ petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. The parties/respondents shall remain bound by the statement given in the Court today.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

MAY 09, 2024

Vishal sharma

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