

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

**CWP No.8740 of 2015
Date of Decision:06/05/2015**

Manu Sharma and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. R.K. Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that to redress their grievance, petitioners No.1 and 3 have filed representations Annexures P-8 and P-9 respectively with the respondent-authorities. He further submits that at this stage, he would be satisfied if the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 to take a decision on the above referred representations. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that so far as petitioner No.2 is concerned, he has not filed any such representation but the representation (Annexure P-8) made by petitioner No.1 may be considered to be a representation on behalf of petitioner No.2 as well.

Since the issue raised by all the three petitioners is similar and I find the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners to be reasonable, without commenting on the merits of the case at this stage, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 to take decision on the representations Annexures P-8 and P-9 by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, preferably within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. The decision so arrived at by respondent No.1 would be considered to be a decision with regard to all the three petitioners.

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

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

**06.05.2015
rajeev**