

-1-

220

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-18797-2021

Date of decision:-30.10.2025

Mahender Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. V.P. Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor of India
(THROUGH V.C.) with
Ms. Neha Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel - UOI
for respondent No.1

Mr. Deepak Vashisth, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.2.

Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate and
Ms. Pranhita Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

1. At the outset, counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the stand taken by respondent No.3 in its short reply, he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach the District Judge, concerned by moving appropriate application under the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. Counsel points out that the petitioner had earlier moved an application, Annexure P4, before District Magistrate,



-2-

220

Charkhi Dadri, which was rejected vide impugned order dated 04.03.2020, Annexure P5. He submits that as limitation for filing an application has expired, appropriate order may be passed so that the petitioner can avail the remedy available to him.

2. Request made by counsel for the petitioner has been considered and is found to be justified.

3. Writ petition is disposed of.

4. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to file an appropriate application before the competent Court under the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. Liberty is also granted to him to seek condonation of delay in moving the application in view of the fact that previous application preferred by petitioner was dismissed vide impugned order, Annexure P5 and this petition has remained pending before this Court for the last more than four years.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

30.10.2025

Brij

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No