



CWP-19692-2025

-1-

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

CWP-19692-2025**Date of decision: 16.07.2025**

Bakshish Singh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. B.R. Rana-I, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a Mandamus upon the Deputy Commissioner-cum-Chairman (Claims Committee, Ludhiana)-respondent No.2, to decide a representation dated 21.12.2023 (Annexure P-2), and a legal notice dated 01.10.2024 (Annexure P-3), as submitted by the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the indolent and lackadaisical approach of the authority concerned, in not deciding representation and legal notice (supra), has propelled the petitioners to approach this Court. He further submits that the limited grievance of the petitioners is that, even though, a considerable time has elapsed, however, no decision on the representation and legal notice (supra), has been taken so far.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and waives service.



At the outset, he, after having apt instructions from respondent No.2, submits that the representation and the legal notice (supra), would be decided, within four weeks from passing of this order. He further submits that the petitioners, if necessary, would also be afforded a due opportunity of hearing.

5. In view of the specific stand taken by learned State, this Court is not required to delve into the merits of the case. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, in terms of the statement made by learned State counsel that the representation and legal notice (supra), would be decided within four weeks from the passing of the order.

6. Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority concerned, shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioners, strictly in accordance with law. It is also expected that respondent No.2 shall adhere to the time line, as apprised to this Court, by the learned State counsel.

7. **Disposed of**, accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

16.07.2025
Ak Sharma

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