

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

**CWP No. 11640 of 2016
Decided on : 04.10.2016**

Summer and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

PRESENT: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Neelam Nehra, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution, *inter alia* seeking a writ in the nature of *Mandamus* for directions to the respondents to consider the representation dated 24th May, 2016, appended as Annexure P-5.

2. It has been claimed that the respondents be directed to adhere to the directions issued by this Court in CWP No. 11637 of 1996 and also the policy letter dated 10th February, 2010 (Annexure P-1), issued by respondent No.4.

3. No reply on behalf of the respondents has been filed.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we

consider it appropriate to dispose of this writ petition by directing

respondent No.3 at this stage, to decide the representation. All the petitioners shall be at liberty to file their individual detailed and comprehensive representations along with the supporting material before respondent No.3. In case such representations are filed by the petitioners, the same shall be decided by respondent No.3 within 2 months thereafter, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the concerned applicants and by passing a speaking order, in accordance with law.

5. It is, however, clarified that the interim order dated 2nd June, 2016, passed by this Court, shall remain operative, during the period, final decision on the representations is taken and one month thereafter. Needless to say, the continuation of the interim order shall not be taken to be any expression of opinion on the merits of the controversy involved in the present writ petition.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

October 04, 2016

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No