



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

CWP-1321-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:03.09.2025

Subhash

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate and
Mr. Vaibhav Bhargav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Udit Garg, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the impugned orders dated 20/27.5.2021 (Annexure P-11), 13.09.2022 (Annexure P-13) and 13.11.2024 (Annexure P-14).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that order dated 20/27.05.2021 (Annexure P-11) passed by the licensing authority whereby after giving the facts of the case, no reason has been mentioned as to why licence of the petitioner has been cancelled and in just one paragraph, it was so observed that the reply was not found satisfactory and therefore the aforesaid order was cryptic and unreasoned order. He further submitted that similar was the position with regard to the order of the appellate authority (Annexure P-13), wherein no reasons have been mentioned at all. He further referred to the order passed by the revisional authority, wherein also no reason has been mentioned for dismissing the revision. He



submitted that in this manner all the three orders which have been passed are totally unreasoned and, therefore, the impugned orders deserve to be set aside.

3. Learned State counsel submitted that he cannot deny the aforesaid fact that reasons have not been mentioned either by the licensing authority, the appellate authority or the revisional authority. He further submitted that he has no objection if the matter is remanded back to the concerned authority for consideration of the issues raised by the petitioner and to deal with the same in accordance with law

4. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.

5. In view of the aforesaid factual position so stated by learned counsels for the parties and a perusal of the impugned orders would show that all the aforesaid three orders on the face of it are cryptic and unreasoned orders.

6. Consequently, the present petition is allowed.

7. The impugned orders Annexures P-11, P-13, and P-14 are hereby set aside. The matter is remanded back to the licensing authority to consider all the grounds taken by the petitioner and to pass an order afresh, which should be a speaking order backed by reasons, after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner or his counsel, within a period of four months from today.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

03.09.2025

shweta

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