



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-4868-2018(O&M)
Date of decision: 23.07.2024

Madan Lal ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sameer S. Tiwari, Advocate, for
Mr. S.S. Brar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. AG, Punjab,
for respondents No.1 & 2.

Mr. Sanjay Kaushal, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Arjun Shukla, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has prayed for a mandamus, commanding respondents to implement the order dated June 5, 2015 (P-2), passed by the Deputy Director, Urban Local Bodies, Ludhiana.

Written statement filed on behalf of respondents No.1 & 2 reveals that aggrieved by the order dated June 5, 2015, M/s Rangi Associates Private Limited (respondent No.3) had preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority. And, vide order dated September 22, 2021, respondent No.3 was directed to comply with the order dated June 5, 2015 (**ibid**), failing which the authorities were directed to take action for cancellation of the licence as per the prescribed procedure. Further, to even initiate proceedings against respondent



No.3, in terms of the provisions of the Punjab Apartment and Property Regulation Act, 1995, and Rules made thereunder.

Learned Senior counsel for respondent No.3 submits that the order dated September 22, 2021, was assailed in a revision before the Directorate, Local Bodies, Punjab, which is pending consideration. And, petitioner too is a party to the said proceedings. He submits that the matter was last listed on July 4, 2024, but was not heard and the next date of hearing is yet to be notified.

Similarly, learned State counsel has shared with us a communication dated July 1, 2024 (copy whereof is retained as **Mark 'X'**), per which the said revision was posted for hearing on July 4, 2024 @ 4:00 PM.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that let this petition be disposed of, for the present, to enable the parties to contest the revision. However, in the given circumstances, he submits that the Revisional Authority be directed to decide the matter within a specified time. Further, after the matter is decided by the Revisional Authority, the party aggrieved by the order so passed, shall be at liberty to avail such other remedies, as admissible in law.

In response, learned State counsel submits that the matter shall be decided within a period of three months from today.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, as also the statements of learned counsel for the parties, the petition is accordingly disposed of with the liberty prayed for.

This Court is sanguine that the authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And the appropriate orders shall be passed within the time indicated by learned State counsel.



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 earlier, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

23.07.2024
Rajan/AK Sharma

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO