

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20704 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision :12.01.2024

Kamal Raj Singh Thind

.....Petitioner

Versus

Greater Mohali Area Development Authority and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL, JUDGE

Present : Mr.Nitish Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral):

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in essence the grievance of the petitioner is that his claim for refund of overcharged interest, penal interest and interest on the amount deposited by him has since been been rejected, vide impugned order dated 23.06.2022 (Annexure P-9), which reads thus:-

“That your application on abovesaid issue after considering has been admitted in the office.”

At the outset, learned counsel for the respondents fairly concedes that *ex facie*, the order is bereft of any reasons, and thus, is unsustainable, therefore, the same be deemed to have been withdrawn. Accordingly, it is submitted that the competent authority would re-examine the matter and pass fresh orders, in accordance with law, and shall assign reasons in support thereof, within a period of two months from today.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

nothing substantive survives in the petition and the same be disposed of in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents.

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

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

12.01.2024
Manoj Bhutani

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