

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(115)

CWP-8614-2024

Date of decision: - 19.04.2024

The Jafarabad Coop. Transport Society Gurugram

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Raj Kaushik, Advocate, and
Mr. Piyush Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

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 an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to issue the Letter of Intent/Stage Carriage permit on the route No.56 i.e. Gurugram to Tauru via Badshapur, Sohana route as a consequence to the office order bearing Endst. No.26968-70 dated 06.07.2022 passed by respondent No.2 (Annexure P-5).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-6) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, respondent No.2 considers the

same, in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents-State has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said representation dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-6), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of six weeks from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-6) filed by the petitioner within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, respondent No.2 is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioner is meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible. In case, respondent No.2 is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioner is meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of six weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 19, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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