



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

CM-19534-CWP-2024 in/and RA-CW-501-2024 in WP-PIL-54-2024
Date of decision : 03.12.2024

Ravinder Kataria

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. R.S. Ghuman, Advocate, for the applicant-respondent No.8.

Mr. Anurag Chopra, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

CM-19534-CWP-2024

In view of reasons mentioned in the application, duly supported by an affidavit, delay of 86 days in filing the review application is condoned.

Application is, accordingly, allowed.

RA-CW-501-2024

1. The present review application has been filed by Bhupinder Pal alias Bhupinder Punj (respondent No.8 in CWP-PIL-154-2024) seeking review of the final order dated 05.08.024 passed in writ petition (CWP-PIL-15-2024), which reads thus :

“1. This petition has been filed as a PIL by the petitioner, who claims himself to be an RTI activist and has made certain allegations against private respondents No.8 and 9 that they are indulging in unlawful activities in the office of Regional Transport Authority, Ludhiana.

2 Since the grievance raised herein is writ large with disputed questions of facts, this Court would not like to enter into merits of the case, especially when



representations have been made by the petitioner to various authorities.

- 3. The petitioner is free to pursue his representations, in particular Annexure P-20 dated 13.06.2023, which is directed to be decided by the concerned authority, to which it is made, and appropriate order be passed thereon.*
- 4. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands disposed of.*
- 5. However, it is made clear that this Court has not commented on merits of the case.”*

- 2. The review applicant, who was respondent No.8 in the writ petition, is seeking review of the final order dated 05.08.2024 on the ground that the order under review is adverse to his interest and, therefore, could not have been passed without hearing him.
- 3. We have gone through the order dated 05.08.2024 and we do not find any observation or direction therein, which may be adverse to the interest of the review applicant/respondent No.8.
- 4. This Court has merely left it open to the petitioner in the writ petition to pursue his representations.
- 5. In view of the above, no apparent error is visible on the face of the record and, therefore, the review application stands dismissed.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

December 03, 2024
narotam

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