

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

CWP No.16550 of 2015

Date of Decision:12/08/2015

Chandro Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, he would be satisfied if the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to take a decision on the legal notice dated 2.9.2013 (Annexure P-3) issued on behalf of the petitioner. I find the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner to be reasonable.

Accordingly, at this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case as also on the issue of limitation, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to take decision on the legal notice dated 2.9.2013 (Annexure P-3) issued on behalf of the petitioner by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, preferably within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioner and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioner, she would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

12.08.2015
rajeev