

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

(113)

CWP-10067-2024**Date of decision: - 03.05.2024****Jashanpreet Singh****....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Amarbir Singh Salar, 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 the respondents to frame new/modified regular time table from Ludhiana to Mohali via Morinda and from Morinda to Ludhiana in the joint time table to operate on the allotted stage carriage permit No.5/Reg/2022 on the route Moga to Nangal and return especially keeping in view of the order dated 04.09.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by the State Transport Commissioner, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-4) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said representation dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-4), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two months 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the representation dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-4) filed by the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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 two months.

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-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law and after hearing all the concerned parties.

May 03, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No