

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

Civil Writ Petition No.26373 of 2014

Date of decision: 6.1.2015

Charanjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr.Vikas Chatrath, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

It is argued that the issue raised in this petition is not *res-integra* and has been declared in favour of employees in CWP No.2605 of 1998; R.K.Aggarwal and others v. State of Punjab and others decided on 2.7.2014. The text of the judgment is placed at Annexure P-1 running from pages 22 to 39 of the paperbook. Relying on the ratio of the aforesaid decision, several petitions have been filed in this Court in which directions have been issued to the State to consider and decide the representations in the light of the aforesaid declaration of law.

It is strange that the people similarly situated are compelled to come to this Court and waste its precious time when the Department could easily identify all cases and pass a common order ending the grievances of the petitioners instead of making them waste time, energy and money to

invoke the writ jurisdiction.

In the circumstances, as nothing new is to be said by this Court, a direction is issued to the State to consider and decide the representation Annexure P-3 submitted by the petitioners to the competent authority and final decision be taken within one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. The competent authority would examine the ratio of the decision of this Court and apply it to the facts of this case while making the decision.

It is also brought to the notice of the respondent department that the salutary directions issued by this Court in **Satbir Singh v. State of Haryana and others**; 2002 (2) SCT 354 are meant to be adhered to and even after the passage of more than a decade, the State does not appear to be acting responsibly in its duty towards its employees and towards this Court.

Disposed of with the above directions.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

January 6, 2015
Paritosh Kumar