



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-17609-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 29.07.2024

M/s Jalandhar Leather (India) Pvt. Ltd.
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and another
... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Gursimran Singh Madaan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Jastej Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner - M/s Jalandhar Leather (India) Pvt. Ltd. has prayed
for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ Petition under article 226 of the Constitution
of India praying for issuance of writ in the nature of
certiorari seeking setting aside of demand letters dated
29.01.2016 (Annexure P-4), dated 28.11.2019 (Annexure
P-6), dated 08.07.2021 (Annexure P-9) and dated
31.10.2023 (Annexure P-11) whereby an illegal, unjust
demand towards enhanced amount has been made by
respondent No.2 While considering application for
permission to mortgage Annexure P-8.

And/OR

Further prayed writ in the nature the mandamus be
issued directing respondent No.2 to consider and grant
permission to mortgage (Annexure P-8) which has been
pending long.”

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prior
to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had even served the respondent-



authorities with a representation dated June 26, 2024 (P-12) qua its concerns and grievances. But to no avail.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Jastej Singh, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab is present in Court on behalf of the respondents. He submits that since the competent authority is already in *seisin* of the representation (**ibid**) of the petitioner, it would be expedient if this petition is disposed of, at this stage, to enable the competent authority to consider the concerns/grievances of the petitioner. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned State counsel. However, he submits that the authorities be directed to take a decision within a specified time.

In response, learned State counsel submits that necessary orders shall be passed within a period of 6 weeks from today.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition stands disposed of. This Court is sanguine that the respondent-authorities shall consider the matter in the right earnest, and pass the appropriate orders in accordance with law.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

29.07.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO