

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

105

CWP-11832-2025

Date of Decision : July 10, 2025

SH. MANJEET CONTRACTOR

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Varun Singh Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. In deference to the hereinafter extracted order passed by this Court on 30.04.2025, today the learned State counsel has placed on record a copy of the speaking order dated 09.07.2025, as drawn by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Gurugram.

“The grievance of the present petitioner, which is encapsulated in the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a mandamus upon the official respondents, is that despite completion of tender turned quotation work of cleaning of master sewer line, which was emergent in nature, till date the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Gurugram (respondent no.2), has not taken final decision on the ex post facto approval which was duly submitted by the authority concerned.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1, and waives service, whereas, Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.2 to 7.

They seek time to file a response to the instant petition.

Adjourned to 22.05.2025.

In the meanwhile, respondent no.2-the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Gurugram, is directed to take a final decision on issue of ex post facto approval, as duly submitted by the authority concerned, within a period of 15 days from the date of passing of this order, and a copy of the decision, so taken, be placed on record.

Reply(ies), if any, be filed, on or before the next date of hearing, with a copy in advance to learned counsel opposite.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that no further request for an adjournment shall be entertained on the next date of hearing, on behalf of either of the parties.”

2. Since a speaking order has already been passed by the competent authority, therefore, no further direction is required to be passed. Hence, the instant writ petition is closed. However, in case, the petitioner has any grievance against the speaking order (supra), it is at liberty to take the apposite legal recourse for redressal thereof.

3. **Disposed of accordingly.**

July 10, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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