



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CWP-31369-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.01.2026

Chamkaur Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Ms. Bhavya, Advocate for
Mr. D.S. Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raghav Goel, AAG Punjab.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the impugned order dated 11.02.2025 (Annexure P-13) passed by respondent No.3 vide which the partial license was restored by the appellate authority to respondent No.4.

2. When notice of motion was issued on 07.11.2025, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that it is a case where the petitioner was the complainant before the Chief Agricultural Officer-cum-Licencing Authority, Ludhiana, whereby he had complained that the seeds which were supplied by respondent No.4 were of inferior quality, as a result of which the licence of respondent No.4 was cancelled but when respondent No.4 filed an appeal before the Appellate Authority, the Appellate Authority modified the order without even



giving notice or even hearing the petitioner who was the complainant. He submitted that the petitioner being the complainant was required to be heard at least because it was on his complaint that the licence of respondent No.4 was cancelled and thus, the Appellate Authority has violated the principles of natural justice.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Shruti, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State of Punjab.

Let separate notice be issued to respondent No.4 on filing of process fee.

Adjourned to 13.01.2026.”

3. As per the report of the Registry, respondent No.4 has been served but nobody has appeared on his behalf.

4. The short issue involved in the present case is that the petitioner, who was the complainant, filed a complaint before the concerned authority against respondent No.4. However, when the appellate authority decided the appeal on 11.02.2025 vide Annexure P-13, the petitioner was not heard. Therefore, the grievance of the petitioner is that there had been a violation of the principles of natural justice.

5. Learned State counsel submitted that the respondent-State has no objection if the appellate order is set aside and the matter is remitted to the concerned appellate authority for fresh consideration in accordance with law, while providing the petitioner an adequate opportunity of personal hearing.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 11.02.2025 (Annexure P-13) is hereby set aside. The matter is remitted back to respondent No.3-Appellate Authority to pass a fresh order in accordance with law within a



period of three months from today after giving adequate opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner or his counsel.

7. It is further directed that the fresh order which is required to be passed by the appellate authority shall be uninfluenced by the earlier order of the appellate authority or by the present order of this Court, as this Court has made no observation on the merits of the case. The appellate authority shall pass the fresh order after hearing all stakeholders or their learned counsels.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

13.01.2026

shweta

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