

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

104

**CWP-9015-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision : April 07, 2025**

VIPIN KUMAR

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Suryaveer Surjewala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Advocate
for the respondent No.3.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

CM-19744-CWP-2024

1. The instant preonement application is **dismissed**, as having been rendered infructuous.

CWP-9015-2022 (O&M)

2. Through the instant writ petition, prayer is made for issuance of directions upon the respondents to consider the various representations submitted by the petitioner and to release the outstanding amount of the development work carried out by him.

3. The work, for which the petitioner is claiming payment, appertains to the year 2015. In the written statement furnished by the respondent No.3, a categorical stand has been taken that, there is no record available with the Municipal Council, Narwana, in respect of the alleged work, as figured in the present petition. It has also been voiced in the written

statement that, despite the respondent No.3 addressing various letters to the petitioner to produce the original record, i.e. tender, work order, EMD receipt, agreement etc., for enabling him to evaluate his claim and thereupon to pass a speaking order, yet nothing has been produced by the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has, except his placing reliance upon Annexure P-17, not brought on record any material document to substantiate the claim of the petitioner. By placing reliance upon Annexure P-17, the learned counsel for the petitioner wants to establish before this Court that, although security amount has been released in favour of the petitioner, however, payment in respect of the work done has not been released.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner, in his beseeching the relief penned down in the lead paragraph of this order, raised highly disputed questions of fact, which cannot be adjudicated by this Court in the instant proceedings, especially in the absence of any admissible document on record, rather the same require them becoming adjudicated after evidence becomes adduced by the parties before the apposite authority/forum. Therefore, the instant writ petition is **dismissed**. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to, in case he has any grievance with regard to non payment of any amount, take recourse to the apposite statutory remedy before the appropriate authority/forum.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

April 07, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No