

2025.PHHC.173614



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

**CWP-24245-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision:10.12.2025**

Banarasi Dass and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CWP-25540-2018 (O&M)

Banarasi Dass

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Ms. Suverna Mutneja, Advocate and
Ms. Jayantika Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Shruti, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vibhor Bansal, Advocate for respondents No.4 and 5.
(in CWP-25540-2018).

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. Both the above-mentioned cases are being taken up together for final disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties as the issues involved are inter-connected and therefore are being disposed of by this common order.

2025.PHHC.173614



2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) submitted that the dispute herein pertains to cancellation of the brick-kiln licence of the petitioner(s) by the official respondents. She further submitted that after the cancellation of the brick-kiln licence, some bricks were lying in the premises which were earlier not permitted to be lifted but subsequently the District Magistrate permitted the petitioner(s) to lift the said bricks. She also submitted that the other two stakeholders, who were later impleaded as respondents No.4 and 5, have no objection to the lifting of the bricks by the petitioner(s) in view of the compromise effected between the parties.

3. She submitted that she does not wish to press both the petitions, wherein the prayer in CWP No. 24245 of 2018 is for setting aside the cancellation of brick klin licence of the petitioner(s) and the prayer in the second writ petition i.e.CWP-25540-2018 vide which prayer has been made for cancellation of licence of M/s Jaitu BKO Jaitu and for restraint on running of brick klin of private respondents and restricts the claim of the petitioner(s) only to a limited extent that the petitioner(s) may be permitted to lift the remaining bricks which are lying on the spot and does not want to press for the grant of licence.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5 submitted that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and they have no objection if the petitioner(s) are permitted to lift the bricks lying at M/s Tarsem Chand Vijay Kumar brick-kiln of petitioner No.2.

2025.PHHC.173614



5. Learned State counsel also submitted that she has obtained specific instructions from the concerned officers and the respondent-State has no objection if the petitioner(s) are permitted to lift the bricks lying at brick-kiln of petitioner No.2, particularly in view of the fact that the petitioner(s) are not pressing the present writ petitions wherein the cancellation orders have been challenged.
6. In view of the aforesaid statements made by all the learned counsels for the parties and the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) seeking withdrawal of both the petitions, the permission is granted and the petitioners are permitted to withdraw both the petitions.
7. In view of the above, present writ petitions are dismissed as withdrawn.
8. The petitioners shall be at liberty to lift the bricks lying at the brick-kiln of petitioner No.2.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

10.12.2025

shweta

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