

113

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

CWP-9144-2024
Date of decision: 24.04.2024

Shri Hazur Sahib Real Estate Private Limited

...Petitioner

Versus

Regional Transport Authority, Patiala

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. P.S. Bawa, 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 issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to approve Regular Joint Time Table on Patiala to Khanna via Amloh & back and Khanna to Ludhiana & back route in view of notification dated 24.07.2023 (Annexure P-2).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 26.03.2024 (Annexure P-3) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 26.03.2024 (Annexure P-3) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then,

to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent would consider the said legal notice dated 26.03.2024 (Annexure P-3), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent to consider the legal notice dated 26.03.2024 (Annexure P-3), in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, respondent would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent 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 six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

24.04.2024

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No