



104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-38621-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.01.2026

MUHAMMAD TAUFIQUE

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Ms. Rosi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents, particularly respondent No.3 to forthwith restore the supply of essential commodities/ration to the petitioner's Public Distribution System (PDS) Depot.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is seeking a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to forthwith restore the supply of essential commodities, as the petitioner was holding a licensed depot, which was suspended on 20.09.2022. She submitted that thereafter an appeal was filed before the Appellate Authority and the matter was remanded back to the Licensing Authority. She further submitted that again vide Annexure P-1 dated 11.11.2025, the earlier order



was directed to be kept intact and in this way, the earlier order passed by the Licencing Authority suspending the licence has been kept intact and submitted that a direction be issued to the respondents to restore the supply.

2. On the other hand, Mr. Udit Garg, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana submitted that he has received an advance copy of the present petition and has also sought instructions in this regard. He submitted that the order of suspension dated 20.09.2022 and the order by which the learned Appellate Authority has remanded back the case have not been attached with the present petition. He further submitted that the present petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground that the petitioner is seeking a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the Licensing authority to restore the supply, whereas the order of suspension has not been challenged in the present petition and therefore, on this ground itself, the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the paper-book, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has sought a writ in the nature of *mandamus* for restoration of supplies without challenging the orders by which the supplies to the petitioner were suspended. In the absence of any challenge to the orders by which the supplies were suspended, no such *mandamus* can be issued.

4. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

08.01.2026

rakesh

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No