



2024:PHHC:099399-DB



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

CWP-28668-2023 (O&M)
Reserved on : 30.07.2024
Pronounced on: 05.08.2024

Jatinder Pal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr. M.L. Saggar, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Sunny Saggar, Advocate,
and Ms. Armaan Saggar, Advocate,
for the petitioner

Mr. Anurag Chopra, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Dharam Vir Sharma, Senior Advocate,
with Ms. Sunder Kumari, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

SUDHIR SINGH, J.

By way of the present writ petition, the petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 15.12.2023 (Annexure P-17) passed by respondent No.1, vide which, the petitioner has been removed from the post of President, Municipal Council, Jagraon, District Ludhiana, for the alleged violation of Section 22 of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911 (for short 'the Act').

2. Brief facts of the case are that the elections of the Municipal Council, Jagraon, were held on 14.02.2021, in which 23 Councillors were elected. The petitioner was elected as



President of the said Municipal Council in the meeting held on 29.04.2021. The petitioner avers that he has been performing his functions to the best of his abilities for the welfare of the inhabitants of the Municipal Council with the co-operation of the majority of the Councillors. On 31.05.2022, resolution No. 65 was passed unanimously by the House regarding 73 Development Works in the area of the Municipal Council, Jagraon. The same was approved by respondent No.2-Director, Department of Local Government, Punjab, vide letter dated 10.08.2023. However, subsequently, respondent No.2 had addressed a letter dated 23.08.2023 staying execution of the said development works till further orders. The petitioner had filed CWP-30263-2022 before this Court, which is still pending adjudication. It is the case of the petitioner that the State of Punjab had formulated a policy regarding employment of Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen by respondent No.4 on contract basis after their selection by the Selection Committee as per DC rates fixed by the Labour Department and that the permission in this regard, was given vide letter dated 22.06.2023.

3. On 11.09.2023, the appointment letters to the said selected Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen were to be issued in the programme to be presided by respondent No.5 i.e. local MLA. The aforesaid prospective contractual employees had assembled before the office of Municipal Council around 5.00 P.M. However, when it was intimated that respondent No.5 would not come to the function due to her ill health, the



appointment letters were given to the selected Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen by the Executive Officer of the Council and the petitioner, in the presence of other Councillors and the media. The petitioner, however, was shocked to receive a show cause notice dated 11.10.2023 (Annexure P-9) intimating that there was a proposal to remove him from the post of President, Municipal Council, Jagraon under Section 22 of the Act. Along with the said communication, detail of charges was also served upon the petitioner and the petitioner was required to submit his reply within a period of 21 days from the date of issue of such notice. The lead charge against the petitioner was that he had got appointment letters issued forcefully by detaining the staff of the council beyond 5:00 p.m. Thereafter, on the request of the petitioner, he was supplied with copy of the report dated 12.09.2023 sent by the Executive Officer of the Council to respondent No.2 in compliance with his letter dated 12.09.2023. However, the petitioner was not supplied the copies of the daily newspapers 'Punjab Kesari' and 'Daily Jagbani' dated 12.09.2023. The petitioner obtained copies of the said newspapers later on. It is the case of the petitioner that Amarjit Singh Malwa, Senior Vice President of the Council, was also a correspondent of the Hind Samachar Group of Newspapers and was under the influence of respondent No.5. As the newspaper reports of 12.09.2023 were published in the said newspapers, which were being published by the Hind Samachar Group of Newspapers, the petitioner alleges that the same was done



under the influence of the aforesaid Senior Vice President and respondent No.5.

4. It is further the case of the petitioner that he had submitted reply dated 31.10.2023 to the aforesaid show cause notice stating therein that there was no violation of Section 22 of the Act. It was further stated that the charges levelled against the petitioner were totally wrong and baseless and that the petitioner did not commit the alleged act of detaining the Executive Officer and the other staff members of the Council in their office beyond 5.00 p.m. Thereafter, the petitioner was asked to appear for personal hearing on 07.12.2023. Subsequently, he was informed by the Executive Officer to appear on 12.12.2023. The petitioner appeared before respondent No.2 and requested him to allow the petitioner to engage a counsel to make submissions on his behalf and further grant him 15 days' time in this regard. However, the request of the petitioner was turned down and an order dated 15.12.2023 was passed by respondent No.1 removing the petitioner from the post of President of the Municipal Council. The petitioner has challenged the said order in the present writ petition being illegal, arbitrary and in violation to the provisions of the Act.

5. Upon notice, respondent Nos. 1 and 2 have filed a joint written statement, stating therein that on 12.09.2023, respondent No.3 had sought report from respondent No.4 in respect of the news published in different newspapers with regard to the issuance of appointment letters to the selected Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen in violation of the



instructions/Rules of the Government by forcibly detaining the staff of the Council after the office hours. Respondent No.4 sent the said report on 12.09.2023 pointing out therein that on 11.09.2023, when he and his staff were about to leave the office at 5.00 P.M., the President of the Safai Sewak Union, Jagraon; the petitioner and some other Members forcibly detained them in the office for getting the appointment letters issued to the Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen. Respondent No.4 had told the petitioner that the programme for offering the appointment letters was to be fixed in a short span of time, but the petitioner remained adamant and had pressurised the staff for issuing the appointment letters. It is further stated that after receipt of the said report, respondent No.3 had sent a detailed report to the higher authorities on 20.09.2023 by observing therein that the petitioner and other members had violated the instructions of the Government by issuing appointment letters forcefully after detaining the staff of the Council beyond the working hours. Still later, on 03.10.2023, a clarification was sought regarding the violation of the Rules and instructions. Respondent No.3, vide letter dated 06.10.2023, clarified that as per Rule 3 of the Punjab Municipal (Executive Officer) Rules, 1976, the Executive Officer of the Council is responsible for the general control of office of the Council and all other employees subordinate to him and that the petitioner had violated the said Rule and, therefore, an action was suggested against the petitioner as per the Rules/instructions. It is further pointed out that after considering the said report of respondent No.3, a show cause



notice dated 11.10.2023 (Annexure P-9) along with detail of charges, was served upon the petitioner. Pursuant to the issuance of said notice, the petitioner inspected the record on 19.10.2023 and thereafter, other documents sought for by the petitioner were supplied to him. The petitioner submitted his reply on 31.10.2023, whereupon comments of respondent No.3 were sought on 17.11.2023. Respondent No.3, in his comments dated 30.11.2023, stated that one Arun Kumar, President, Safai Sewaks Union, Jagraon, had given his signed statement on 20.11.2023 stating that the petitioner had issued threats and instigated him and his co-workers to sit outside the office of the Council after closing the door and that he had never pressurised the petitioner for issuance of the appointment letters. It is further stated that after considering the comments of respondent No.3, an opportunity of personal hearing was given to the petitioner on 07.12.2023, but he failed to appear, whereas aforesaid Arun Kumar appeared on 07.12.2023 and reiterated his statement earlier given to respondent No.3. Another opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioner on 12.12.2023. The petitioner appeared before the authorities and submitted that the allegations levelled against him were false and that he had not committed any dereliction of duties. However, the authorities did not find any substance in the stand of the petitioner and accordingly, passed the impugned order removing the petitioner from the post of President of the Council.

6. Respondent No.4-Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Jagraon, has filed his separate written statement



stating therein that he along with his staff was forced by the petitioner to issue appointment letters to the selected Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen on 11.09.2023 by detaining them in the office beyond five 5.00 p.m. It was further pointed out that the situation was made grim and intolerable. The Executive Officer and the staff members were detained till the appointment letters were not given to the Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen. They were allowed to leave only after the appointment letters were issued to them.

7. Learned Senior counsel, appearing for the petitioner, has vehemently argued that the act of the petitioner in facilitating issuance of appointment letters to the contractual Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen was in terms of the policy decision of the State of Punjab. It is further argued that on 11.09.2023, the said appointment letters were to be issued in the presence of the local MLA, but when after sufficient wait, the said MLA could not reach the office of the Municipal Council, Jagraon due to her ill health, the Executive Officer and the petitioner had distributed the said appointment letters to the Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen. It is, thus, argued that it is not a case, where the petitioner has facilitated issuance of such appointment letters to the persons not eligible and/or entitled for issuance of such appointment letters. He has further argued that though, it is the stand of the official respondents in their written statements, that the aforesaid appointment letters were to be issued in a programme to be fixed soon, but no details are forthcoming regarding the fixation of such



programme with specific date(s) and timing. It is, thus, submitted that the said averments have been made only to buttress the claim of the official respondents that the petitioner had violated the Rules and instructions of the Government.

8. Learned Senior counsel has further argued that if, the petitioner had confined the Executive Officer and other staff members of the Municipal Council in the office beyond 5:00 p.m. and compelled them to issue appointment letters, the Executive Officer, who according to the stand of the respondents, is empowered to control the affairs of the Municipal Council in terms of Rule 3 of the aforesaid Rules, should have immediately brought the matter to the notice of the higher authorities, but nothing of the sort was done. As a matter of fact, the Executive Officer and the staff members were not duty bound to accept the alleged forceful act of the petitioner, particularly when the Executive Officer himself claims that as per Rule 3 of the aforesaid Rules, he is empowered to control the affairs of the Municipal Council. This clearly shows that there was no forceful act on the part of the petitioner. It is further submitted that though, the official respondents claimed that the cognizance was taken on the basis of the media reports, yet it is submitted that two newspapers i.e. 'Punjab Kesari' and 'Daily Jag Bani' were controlled by the Hind Samachar Group, which according to the petitioner, were influenced by respondent No.5 i.e. local MLA.

9. On the other hand, learned State counsel and the learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.4, while controverting the arguments of the learned Senior counsel for



the petitioner, have argued that in the instant case, the petitioner was never authorized by any Rule, office order or instructions to issue the appointment letters. It is further argued that the State Government was planning to fix a programme very soon to deliver the said appointment letters to the selected contractual employees, but the entire mechanism had been defeated by the forceful act of the petitioner and the same amounts to be an abuse of power. It is further argued that being the President of the Council, the petitioner was to act responsibly and in a manner becoming a public representative. In the instant case, the petitioner had usurped the power of the Chief Executive Officer, as defined under Rule 3 of the aforesaid Rules and got the appointment letters distributed by interfering in the duties of the Chief Executive Officer. Learned State counsel has further argued that the show cause notice, along with charges, was issued to the petitioner after a detailed enquiry in the matter and the impugned order was passed after seeking the reply of the petitioner and giving him an opportunity of person hearing, wherein he could not justify his action.

10. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the paper book, the following questions arise for adjudication in the present petition:-

1. Whether the act of the petitioner in facilitating issuance of appointment letters to the selected contractual Safai Sewaks (Sweepers) and Sewermen, amounts to an abuse of power?



2. Depending upon the answer of Question no.1, whether the impugned order passed by the respondents is legal and valid?

11. Coming to Question No.1, the show cause notice issued to the petitioner on 11.10.2023 (Annexure P-9) was in terms of Section 22 of the Act. In the said show cause notice, the official respondents had contemplated to remove the petitioner from the post of President of the Council and had also supplied him the details of charges. The translated version of said charges annexed with the petition by the petitioner, would read as under:-

“As the Additional Deputy Commissioner (U.D.), Ludhiana has brought to the notice of the Government vide letter No.A.D.C(U.D)-G3/2023/6329 dated 20.09.2023 that the report was sought from the Municipal council, Jagraon regarding news reported in the media regarding issue of appointment letters to the Safai Sewaks/Sewermen on contract basis by the Municipal Council, Jagraon on 11.09.2023 at 5.00 p.m. by the Municipal Council, Jagraon. On it the Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Jagraon has reported to the Additional Deputy Commissioner (U.D.) vide letter No.2503 dated 12.09.2023. According to it, the appointment letters were issued by the Municipal Council, Jagraon on 11.09.2023 at 7.30 p.m. by forcibly detaining the staff of Municipal Council, Jagraon, thus you are liable for the following charges:-

1. The appointment letters were to be issued to the Safai Sewaks/Sewermen on contract basis by the Municipal Council, Jagraon and this work was to be completed by fixing the programme as per the instructions of the Government. The programme was to be chaired by the authority appointed by Government. The matter was discussed and considered with the



President of the Safai Union and the authorities for this programme.

2. On 11.09.2023 at about 5.00 p.m. the Executive Officer and other office staff was to leave the office, then the President of the Safai Sewak Union, their some members and some other persons and (President), Municipal Council, Jagraon (you) detained (Ghareoed) the Executive Officer and the other concerned staff to issue appointment letters to the adhoc Safai Sewaks and Sewermen today itself on 11.09.2023 and threatened that the appointment letters shall be given today. If this is not done, the Executive Officer and the staff shall not be allowed to leave outside. You got closed the door of the room of the office of the Municipal Council, Jagraon from the Members and other persons and made sit the Safai Sewaks outside. At that time, the request was made to you (President), Municipal Council, Jagraon and other members that this programme has already been finalized and the programme is to be fixed and the appointment letters shall be issued as per that programme but the President and other present Members and persons pressurized and remained adamant. The situation was made serious and not tolerable. The Executive Officer and the other concerned Members were detained till the appointment letters were not given and they were allowed to leave the office at 7.30 p.m. after getting the appointment letters. Executive Officer, Accountant, Sanitary Inspector, Harish Clerk Sanitation Branch and other staff were detained in the office. President, Members and Safai Union pressurized again and again for the issue of appointment letters but the appointment letters were not issued and they got distributed the appointment letters themselves forcibly.

3. This was not such a situation which cannot be avoided and the appointment letters were necessarily required to be taken now and today itself. The Government instructions/ Rules and protocol had been violated by doing so and grim and situation- confidence



is created for the Government machinery. The news have appeared in the media about this incident, which shows that what was happened at that time.

4. Besides it, the whole illegal action was taken by the President of Safai Sewak Union, Union Staff and some of their Members and other persons at your instance and instructions whereas being President of the Municipal Council, you were to stand against this incidence but you have taken whole illegal action himself.

5. Besides it, it has been brought to the notice of the Government that the Executive Officer has not been given opportunity to get the conditions of the appointment letters checked from the Accounts Branch as per law, therefore, you have allowed to deal the file legally as per office functioning.”

12. The petitioner submitted reply denying the said charges and thereafter, respondent No.1 passed the impugned order on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner stood proved and while working on the post of President, he had acted illegally against the Municipal Council and misused his position, which had affected the image of the Municipal Council.

13. The charges leveled against the petitioner for his removal, are to be examined in the context of the provisions of Section 22 of the Act. The said Section would read as under:-

“22. Resignation or removal of President and Vice-President.

Whenever a President or Vice-President vacates his seat or tenders in writing to the committee his resignation of his office, he shall vacate his office; and any president or vice-president may be removed from office by the State Government on the ground of abuse of his powers or habitual failure to perform his duties



or in pursuance of a resolution requesting his removal passed by two-thirds of the members of the committee:

Provided that if a resolution requesting the removal of the President or the Vice-President is passed by two-thirds of the members of the committee the President or, as the case may be the Vice- President shall be deemed to be under suspension immediately after such resolution is passed:

Provided further that before the State Government notifies his removal, the reason for his proposed removal shall be communicated to him by means of a registered letter in which he shall be called upon to tender within twenty-one days an explanation in writing and if no such explanation is received in the office of the appropriate Secretary to Government within twenty one days of the despatch of the said registered letter, the State Government may proceed to notify his removal.”

As per the said Section, the President may be removed from the office by the State Government on the ground of abuse of his powers or for habitual failure to perform his duties or when a resolution is passed by two-third of the Members of the council. A perusal of the impugned order would show that the same has been passed on the ground of alleged irregularities committed by the petitioner under the influence of his political position, thereby damaging the image of the Municipal Council, Jagraon.

14. This Court is to see, whether the act on the part of the petitioner is an abuse of power or not, as other two grounds mentioned in Section 22 of the Act, are not attracted in the instant case.

15. In *Black's Law Dictionary* (7th Edn., 1999), the term 'abuse of power' has been defined in to mean “abuse” as “to



depart from legal or reasonable use in dealing with (a person or thing)”, “to injure (a person) physically or mentally”, “to damage (a thing)”.

In the Advance Law of Lexicon, The Encyclopaedic Law Dictionary with Words & Phrases, Legal Maxims and Latin Terms’ 5th Edition, the term ‘abuse of power’ has been defined as under:-

“Abuse of power:-

‘An abuse of power’ means that when a person has powers to do a certain thing, he exercises that power in a manner in which authority is not given to him to exercise it.

The expression ‘abuse of powers’ occurring in S.22 of the Act would mean a course of conduct or plurality of aberration or failure in exercise of power and that too involving dishonesty of intention.’

16. From a plain reading of the aforesaid definition of abuse of power, it will normally imply that abuse means ‘misuse’ i.e. using one’s position by corrupt or illegal means or otherwise than those means. Abuse of power means, a willful abuse or intentional wrong. But, an honest exercise of power, though it may be erroneous, is not an abuse of power.

17. The matter is not *res integra*. In **Tarlochan Dev Sharma vs. State of Punjab & others**, (2001) 6 SCC 260, the provisions of Section 22 of the Act came up for consideration before the Hon’ble Supreme Court. In the said matter, the petitioner therein was removed from the post of President, under Section 22 of the Act. Charge No.3, against the petitioner therein for removal, was that he had asked the Executive Officer of the Municipal Council, Rajpura that payments of the fogging machine should not be made. Thus, his action was termed to be



against the interest of the Municipal Council, Rajpura and he was removed from the post of President. He challenged his removal by way of a writ petition before the High Court. But, the High Court had dismissed the writ petition. In appeal, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while setting aside the order passed by the High Court, allowed the writ petition filed by the petitioner therein and accordingly, the impugned order removing him from the post of President, Municipal Council, Rajpura, under Section 22 of the Act was quashed and set aside. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that unless there is dishonesty or extraneous consideration in doing an act by the President, he cannot be removed from such post on the ground of misuse of power. It was held as under:-

“7. In a democracy governed by rule of law, once elected to an office in a democratic institution, the incumbent is entitled to hold the office for the term for which he has been elected unless his election is set aside by a prescribed procedure known to law. That a returned candidate must hold and enjoy the office and discharge the duties related therewith during the term specified by the relevant enactment is a valuable statutory right not only of the returned candidate but also of the constituency or the electoral college which he represents. Removal from such an office is a serious matter. It curtails the statutory term of the holder of the office. A stigma is cast on the holder of the office in view of certain allegations having been held proved rendering him unworthy of holding the office which he held. Therefore, a case of availability of a ground squarely falling within Section 22 of the Act must be clearly made out. A President may be removed from office by the State Government, within the meaning of Section 22, on



the ground of “abuse of his powers” (of President), inter alia. This is the phrase with which we are concerned in the present case.

xx xx xx

The word “abuse” as occurring in Section 5(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947 came up for consideration of this Court in *M. Narayanan Nambiar v. State of Kerala* [AIR 1963 SC 1116 : (1963) 2 Cri LJ 186] . This Court observed: (AIR p. 1118, para 10)

“‘Abuse’ means misuse i.e. using his position for something for which it is not intended. That abuse may be by corrupt or illegal means or otherwise than those means. The word ‘otherwise’ has wide connotation and if no limitation is placed on it, the words ‘corrupt’, ‘illegal’, and ‘otherwise’ mentioned in the clause become surplusage, for on that construction every abuse of position is gathered by the clause. So some limitation will have to be put on that word and that limitation is that it takes colour from the preceding words along with which it appears in the clause, that is to say, something savouring of dishonest act on his part. The contention of the learned counsel that if the clause is widely construed even a recommendation made by a public servant for securing a job for another may come within the clause and that could not have been the intention of the legislature. But in our view such innocuous acts will not be covered by the said clause. The juxtaposition of the word ‘otherwise’ with the words ‘corrupt or illegal means’, and the dishonesty implicit in the word ‘abuse’ indicate the necessity for a dishonest intention on his part to bring him within the meaning of the clause.”

10. To find the meaning of a word or expression not defined in an enactment the courts apply the “subject-and-object rule” which means ascertain carefully the subject of the enactment where the word or expression occurs and have regard to the object which the legislature has in view. Forego the strict grammatical or etymological propriety of language, even its



popular use; let the subject or the context in which they are used and the object which the legislature seeks to attain be your lenses through which look for the meaning to be ascribed.

“In selecting one out of the various meanings of a word, regard must always be had to the context as it is a fundamental rule that the meanings of words and expressions used in an Act must take their colour from the context in which they appear. Therefore when the context makes the meaning of a word quite clear, it becomes unnecessary to search for and select a particular meaning out of the diverse meanings a word is capable of, according to lexicographers.... Judge Learned Hand cautioned ‘not to make a fortress out of the dictionary’ but to pay more attention to ‘the sympathetic and imaginative discovery’ of the purpose or object of the statute as a guide to its meaning.”
(See *Principles of Statutory Interpretation*, Justice G.P. Singh, 7th Edn., 1999, pp. 258-59.)

11. The expression “abuse of powers” in the context and setting in which it has been used cannot mean use of power which may appear to be simply unreasonable or inappropriate. It implies a wilful abuse or an intentional wrong. An honest though erroneous exercise of power or an indecision is not an abuse of power. A decision, action or instruction may be inconvenient or unpalatable to the person affected but it would not be an abuse of power. It must be such an abuse of power which would render a Councillor unworthy of holding the office of President. Inasmuch as an abuse of power would entail adverse civil consequences, the expression has to be narrowly construed. Yet again, the expression employed in Section 22 is “abuse of his powers or of habitual failure to perform his duties”. The use of plural powers, and the setting of the expression in the framing of Section 22 is not without significance. It is suggestive of legislative intent. The phrase “abuse of powers” must take colour from the next following expression — “or habitual failure to perform duties”. A singular or casual aberration or failure in exercise of power is not enough; a course of conduct or plurality of aberration or failure in exercise of power and that too involving dishonesty of intention is “abuse of powers” within the meaning of Section 22 of the Act. The legislature could not have intended the occupant of an elective office, seated by popular verdict, to be shown exit for a single innocuous action or error of decision...”



18. The controversy involved in the present case is somewhat similar. In the instant case, it is not the case of the official respondents that the persons, whom the appointment letters were issued to, were not eligible or entitled to receive the same. Rather, it is the case of the official respondents that the same were to be distributed in a programme which was yet to be fixed. Thus, the question remains that at best, the petitioner had tried to take credit for issuing appointment letters to the selected contractual employees, at an earlier date. It is also not the case of the official respondents that the said appointment letters have ever been withdrawn by them, meaning thereby, that the employees, who were selected to be engaged on contractual basis, are working in the Municipal Council pursuant to the issuance of said appointment letters. The act of the petitioner may be, a decision taken in a haste and under excitement to win the praise and fame in order to earn credit, but it cannot be said to be a abuse of power, especially when there is no allegation by the official respondents that the same was done dishonestly or for any extraneous consideration or by using the corrupt practices. Therefore, this single act may amount to misuse of power, but not an abuse of power. Still further, even if, the act is considered to be a misuse of power, the same does not have the gravity of causing any loss to the Municipal Council or the public exchequer, as it is an undisputed position that the Safai Sewaks and Sewermen had been duly selected and they were to join their service after issuance of the appointment letters. Thus, in any manner, the said act of the petitioner cannot be termed to



be an abuse of power, so as to warrant his removal from the office.

19. In view of the above, we find that there is no abuse of power on the part of the petitioner. Question No.1 is answered in negative.

20. As question No.1 has been answered in negative, it will follow the necessary consequences and render the impugned order untenable in the eyes of law. Accordingly, we quash and set aside the impugned order dated 15.12.2023 (Annexure P-17) passed by respondent No.1, whereby the petitioner has been removed from the post of President, Municipal Council, Jagraon, District Ludhiana.

21. The writ petition is allowed in the above terms.

22. All pending applications (if any), shall also stand disposed of.

(SUDHIR SINGH)
JUDGE

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

05.08.2024
Ajay Prasher

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