

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

DATE OF DECISION: MAY 27, 2015

Amrit Lal

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

The State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. O. P. Gabba, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of counsel for the petitioner that the claim is covered in favour of the petitioner by the judgements passed by this Court in Civil Writ Petition No.1970 of 2010 (Ajit Rai Vs. The State of Punjab and others), decided on 05.02.2010 (Annexure P-4) and Civil Writ Petition No.6489 of 2012 (Baljit Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others), decided on 04.04.2012 (Annexure P-5). Counsel contends that while relying upon the said judgements, the petitioner, who is similarly placed, had served a legal notice through counsel dated 21.07.2014 (Annexure P-6) upon the respondents but the same has not been decided till date.

Counsel contends that the petitioner, at this stage, would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Chief Engineer (Vigilance), Irrigation and Works, Punjab, Chandigarh and the Executive Engineer, Easter

Division, Irrigation Department, Canal Colony, Ferozepur, respondent Nos.2 and 3 respectively, to consider and decide the legal notice dated 21.07.2014 (Annexure P-6) filed by the petitioner, within some specified time.

In view of the statement made by the counsel for the petitioner and without going into the merit of the case or commenting thereon, the present writ petition is disposed of with directions to the Chief Engineer (Vigilance), Irrigation and Works, Punjab, Chandigarh and the Executive Engineer, Easter Division, Irrigation Department, Canal Colony, Ferozepur, respondent Nos.2 and 3 respectively, to consider and decide the legal notice dated 21.07.2014 (Annexure P-6) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

In case the claim of the petitioner is accepted, the consequential benefits, if any, be released to him, in accordance with law, within a further period of one month.

In case the claim of the petitioner is not to be accepted, then a well reasoned and speaking order be passed and conveyed to the petitioner forthwith.

May 27, 2015
khurmi

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE