



120

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

CWP-12001-2024

Date of decision: 22.05.2024

M/s Bajwa Hardhan Bus Service (Regd.) Batala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Rohit Kapoor, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. TPS Walia, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.3 to frame and approve a fresh joint Time Table for regulating the Stage Carriage Services on Amritsar to Pathankot and back route, in consonance with the mandatory provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, Statutory Scheme dated 22.02.2018 and the directions issued by respondent No.1. Further prayer has been made to implement the Joint Time Tables dated 13.10.2023 (Annexures P-10 and P-11) on the route in question.

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 10.01.2024 (Annexure P-14) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.3 is directed to consider the



said legal notice dated 10.01.2024 (Annexure P-14) 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 No.3 would consider the said legal notice dated 10.01.2024 (Annexure P-14), 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 No.3 to consider the legal notice dated 10.01.2024 (Annexure P-14), 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 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 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 No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

22.05.2024

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No