



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

236

CWP-15203-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.11.2024

Karan Singh Yadav ...Petitioner
Versus
Union of India and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Rajeev Anand and Mr. Ujwal Anand, Advocates
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anita Balyan, Advocate for the respondents-UOI.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing of order, Annexure P-8, on the sole premise that prior thereto, no notice was issued, had the same been done, the petitioner had valid grounds to resist the same, which may or may not have found favour. Learned counsel, on instructions from the petitioner, prays that the matter be reconsidered.
2. Learned counsel for the respondents-UOI, on instructions, submits that the respondents would not be averse to having a relook at the same.
3. It would be gainful to refer to the judgment of **Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation vs. Bal Mukund Bairwa**, (2009) 4 SCC 299, wherein Hon'ble the Supreme Court by relying on the judgments in **Sawai Singh vs. State of Rajasthan**, (1986) 3 SCC 454, **A.R. Antulay vs. R.S. Nayak**, (1988) 2 SCC 602 and **Narinder Mohan Arya vs. United India Insurance Co. Ltd.**, (2006) 4 SCC 713, observed that an order passed in violation of the principles of natural justice, would be nothing but a nullity,



since the purpose of it is prevention of miscarriage of justice, thus it is the pragmatic requirement of fair play in action to observe the same.

4. In view of the above and without commenting on the merits of the case, this petition is hereby disposed of with a direction to the respondents to reconsider the matter, within a period of 2 months, in accordance with law, by passing a speaking order after granting opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

5. Interim order to continue till the decision is taken.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

12.11.2024
Hemant

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