

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

MUKESH KUMAR SALUJA
2015-01-28 17:25
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

**CWP No.13632-2014
Date of decision:28.01.2015**

Virender Kumar Handa

...Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director, UHBVNL, Panchkula and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr.Pankaj Maini, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the alleged inaction on the part of respondent authorities, petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of certiorari/mandamus.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset, submits that he does not intend to press this writ petition for the writ in the nature of certiorari, for the time being. He places reliance on the representation dated 5.1.2010 (Annexure P-4), to contend that when the particulars of the petitioner are compared with his co-employee Shashi Bala, the arbitrary and discriminatory action of the respondents becomes clear. He further submits that when no action was taken on the representation of the petitioner, he again approached the respondent authorities vide his self-contained representation dated 11.4.2012 (Annexure P-5) but the same is also pending decision. He also places reliance on the two judgments of this Court in **Balwant Singh v. State of Haryana and others, 2011(2) SCT 285** and **Major Singh Khatkar and others v. State of Punjab and others, 2011(4)**

SCT 786, to contend that delay alone may not disentitle the petitioner for the relief being claimed. He concluded by submitting that petitioner will be satisfied in case respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide his representation (Annexure P-5), within a reasonable time.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and without expressing any opinion on the merits of case, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, the Chief Engineer Operations, UHBVNL, Rohtak-respondent No.2, is directed to look into the matter, consider the grievance of the petitioner raised vide his representation dated 11.4.2012 (Annexure P-5) and decide the same keeping in view the above-said judgments of this Court, at an early date, by passing an appropriate order thereon, strictly in accordance with law, but in any case within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

With the above-said observations made and directions issued, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

28.01.2015
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE