

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH

117

2026:PHHC:068271



CRWP-5163-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 04.05.2026.

M/S S.A. SINGH AND COMPANY

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Anant Bir Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

Seeking appropriate directions to official respondents No.1 to 3
to decide the representation dated 28.04.2026 submitted by the petitioner, the
instant petition has been filed.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contends
that the petitioner is a partnership firm constituted vide partnership deed dated
01.04.2016 between Sukhchain Singh son of Ajaib Singh and Amrik Singh son
of Gurbachan Singh. It is contended that the petitioner has been working as
Transport/Labour and Cartage contractor for various agencies in the State of
Punjab for the past several years to the utmost satisfaction of the agencies. It is

submitted that the petitioner submitted a tender for the HTC Dhuri in accordance with the Tender Enquiry. The bid of the petitioner was accepted and vide letter dated 09.04.2026, the tender was allotted in favour of the petitioner for a period of two years at quoted rate of 119% ASOR. The petitioner submitted Bank Guarantee for the tender on 17.04.2026 as per the terms and conditions. It is contended that for execution of the work, the petitioner arranged his own Labour and trucks for Handling and Transport Contract at Centers in Dhuri. It is contended that respondents No. 5 to 7 who are President and Members of Truck Operators Union, Dhuri have strong political hold at Dhuri, due to their vested interests, have threatened to create hindrance in the Tender Work of the Petitioner. It is contended that on 25.04.2026 when the petitioner was meeting the Truck Operators at Dhuri, respondents No. 5 to 7 illegally stopped the petitioner and threatened to damage the trucks and also to cause personal loss and injury to the labour. It is contended that the loading season is about to commence and the respondents intend to create hindrance in the work of the petitioner. He further contends that in this regard, a representation has been sent by the petitioner, however, neither any decision has been taken thereupon nor has the due and undisputed payment been released by the respondents. He contends that he would be satisfied in case the respondent authorities are directed to look into the representation dated 28.04.2026 submitted by the petitioner and the grievance espoused therein and a speaking order is passed thereupon in accordance with law and in a time bound manner.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. A.M. Garg, Advocate, also enters appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 to 7 Through Video Conference and accepts notice.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the averments made in the present petition as well as the representation dated 28.04.2026 submitted by the petitioner, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of at this juncture and the respondent No.3 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur, is directed to take note of the representation dated 28.04.2026 submitted by the petitioner and to pass a speaking and reasoned order thereupon in accordance with law and preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

May 04, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No