

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

2025:PHHC:088340-DB



(111+231)

CWP-17526-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.07.2025

M/s Lumino Industries Ltd.

--Petitioners

Versus

Punjab State Transmission Corporation Ltd. & others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL.

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA.

Present:- Mr. Sanjay Kaushal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Prem Kandpal, Advocate and
Ms. Ojaswini Gagneja, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate with
Ms. Preeti Agroa, Advocate for respondents
no.1 to 3.

Mr. R.S. Pandher, Addl. A.G., Punjab for
respondent no.4.

LISA GILL.J (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing debarment order dated
05.06.2025 (Annexure P-31).

2. Primary argument raised by learned counsel for petitioner is
that order dated 05.06.2025 (Annexure P-31) debarring the petitioner from
business dealings with PSTCL for one year, has been passed without even
issuing show cause notice to this effect.

3. Learned counsel for respondent-Corporation, on instructions,
submits that as per record, show cause notice was indeed not issued. He
refers to communication dated 17.07.2025 received by him through e-mail,
whereby respondents have decided to withdraw debarment order dated

05.06.2025. However, he seeks liberty to initiate fresh proceedings against petitioner, strictly in accordance with law and by adhering to the principles of natural justice. Communication dated 17.07.2025 reads as under:-

“In reference to your email dated 17.07.2025, it is stated, as per the instructions received from the higher authorities of PSTCL, that PSTCL has decided to withdraw the debarment order dated 05.06.2025. PSTCL further seeks liberty from the Hon'ble Court to initiate fresh proceedings against the petitioner strictly in accordance with law and by adhering to the principles of natural justice. This would include issuance of a show cause notice indicating the proposed action, consideration of the petitioner's reply and, if warranted, the passing of a reasoned (speaking) order, which may include the imposition of a penalty such as blacklisting. It is respectfully submitted that such liberty may kindly be granted by the Hon'ble Court.”

4. In view of specific stand of respondents, as above, no further orders are called for in this matter and writ petition is in fact rendered infructuous. Learned counsel for petitioner does not deny the same

5. Writ petition is accordingly disposed of as infructuous with the observations that necessary action in terms of the stand as projected above by respondents, be taken in accordance with law.

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

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

18.07.2025
lucky

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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