



CWP-20048-2022

1

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

(235)

CWP-20048-2022

Date of Decision : 04.03.2025

M/s M.L. Katha Udyog

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Advocate and
Ms. Rajinder Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.3-PSPCL.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a writ, in the nature of certiorari, seeking quashing of order dated 29.03.2022 (Annexure P-17), passed by the Department of Forests and Wildlife Preservation, Punjab, respondent No.2, wherein, a direction was passed by the distribution licensee, to disconnect the connection of the petitioner, on the ground that his licence has not been renewed.

2. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner, at the first instance, has made an attempt to challenge the legality of the order (supra). However, during the course of the arguments, he submits that his application for renewal of licence, is still pending since 2017, and till date, the respondent No.2, has not taken any decision, either by declining or accepting the grant of renewal of licence to the petitioner.



CWP-20048-2022

2

3. Learned counsel further submits that at this stage, he would be satisfied, if a mandamus is passed upon the respondent No.2, to take a final decision on the application, so preferred by the petitioner.

4. The prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, is not opposed by the learned counsel for the State, and he raises no objection, in case a mandamus is passed upon the respondent No.2, concerned.

5. In view of the above consensus, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, with a mandamus upon the respondent No.2, to take a final decision on the application, so preferred by the petitioner, wherethrough, he has sought for renewal of licence.

6. In case, the competent authority concerned, comes to a conclusion, that the petitioner is not entitled for renewal of licence, the latter after affording an adequate opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, shall pass a speaking order.

7. The above said exercise shall be carried out within a period of three months, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order/judgment.

8. In the meantime, the distribution licensee is directed, to not give effect to the impugned order (supra), till the final decision is taken by the authorities concerned, on the application so preferred by the petitioner.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

March 04, 2025
Manpreet

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