

115

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

CWP-7650-2024
Date of decision: 05.04.2024

Kamaldeep Kaur ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Damanbir Singh Sobti, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. TPS Walia, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.3 to prepare the fresh time-table on the Jalandhar to Dasuya, Mukerian, Pathankot, Dalhousie, Jammu, Katra etc. and back as per the order dated 03.10.2011 (Annexure P-3) passed by the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that subsequent to her legal notices (Annexures P-6 and P-8), respondent No.3 had fixed the date of 13.06.2023 for fixing the time table and same was also published in the Motor Transport Gazette on 01.06.2023 for framing of the time table but the same was not finalized and thereafter had again fixed the date of 19.02.2024 for approval of the time table on the route in question and the same was published in the Motor Transport Gazette on 01.02.2024

but the same has not been finalized. It is further submitted that with respect to the said aspect, the petitioner would give a representation to respondent No.3 and she would be satisfied at this stage in case respondent No.3 considers the same as expeditiously as possible and proceed in accordance with law.

3. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to give a detailed representation to respondent No.3 giving the details of her grievances and respondent No.3 is directed to consider and decide the same in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, respondent No.3 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of said representation.

4. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

05.04.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No