



204
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-27609-2022(O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.11.2025

BALJINDER SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Bhargav, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature *certiorari* for quashing the impugned order dated 14.08.2020 (Annexure P-5) passed by respondent No.3 and order dated 16.11.2021 (Annexure P-7) passed by respondent No.2.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was a ration depot holder for the purpose of distribution of foodgrains. He submitted that on account of political rivalry in the village, some complaints were given against the petitioner and a preliminary enquiry was conducted in this regard. He submitted that the licensing authority while relying upon the complaints and on the basis of statements of



some witnesses cancelled the licence of the petitioner. He further submitted that there were other witnesses also who supported the petitioner but no reference was made to their statements. He submitted that even otherwise also, a perusal of the impugned order (Annexure P-5) passed by the licensing authority would show that after merely recording the facts of the case, no cogent reason was assigned for cancelling the licence of the petitioner. He submitted that when the petitioner filed an appeal before the Appellate Authority, the learned Appellate Authority vide Annexure P-7 again after only referring to the facts of the case dismissed the appeal without recording any reasons whatsoever, merely observing that the behaviour of the petitioner towards the people was not good and the order passed by the licensing authority was in accordance with rules. He submitted that such an order which has been passed by the appellate authority is cryptic and non-speaking and is therefore liable to be set aside.

3. Mr. Nitin Kaushal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana has submitted that so far as the aforesaid non-recording of the reasons is concerned, the same cannot be disputed, especially when the appellate authority has passed the order without assigning any reason.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused both the impugned orders.

5. A perusal of the appellate order (Annexure P-7) would show that after recording the facts of the case, the appellate authority merely observed that the behaviour of the petitioner was not good towards the people but it did not record any reason as to whether the aforesaid bad behaviour would constitute a valid ground for cancellation of the licence or



not. Thereafter, the Appellate Authority simply recorded that the order passed by the licensing authority was in accordance with rules. This Court is of the considered view that the order passed by the Appellate Authority is not a reasoned order and it is cryptic order. On this ground, the appellate order deserves to be set aside.

6. Consequently, the present petition is partly allowed. The order dated 16.11.2021 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Appellate Authority is hereby set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Appellate Authority for passing a fresh order by fresh application of mind and in accordance of law. While passing the fresh order, the Appellate Authority shall be uninfluenced by the earlier appellate order as well as the present order passed by this Court. The petitioner or his counsel shall be given an opportunity of hearing before passing an order and thereafter, a reasoned order shall be passed within a period of four months from today.

10.11.2025*rakesh***(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)****JUDGE**

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