

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-8382-2024
Date of decision : 18.04.2024

M/s Ravidass Trasnport Company (Regd.)

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Saurav Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.T.P.S. Walia, AAG, Punjab.

Mr.H.S.Jalal, Advocate
for the complainant-objector.

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 mandamus directing the respondent authorities to issue new time table for the buses/ vehicles of the petitioner as per the order dated 03.10.2011 (Annexure P-4) passed by the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, Punjab.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 04.03.2024 (Annexure P-3) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the legal notice is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, necessary

relief be granted to the petitioner.

3.

Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider the said legal notice and decide the same within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.
4.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent no.1 to consider the legal notice dated 04.03.2024 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the pleas of the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the pleas of the petitioner are not found to be meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order. It would be open to the competent authority of respondent no.1 to hear all the parties who have the right to be heard, before taking a final decision.
5.

It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider and decide the legal notice independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

April 18, 2024
Davinder Kumar

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