

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.19431 of 2012

Date of Decision:-08.12.2016.

Multan Pal and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Vivek Goel, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Anil Mehta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ravi Kant Sharma, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

Short question for consideration in the present writ petition is that the petitioners are stated to have worked for more than three years and their services have not been considered while passing the Official Memorandum dated 18.8.2012 (Annexure P-6). After the said Memorandum (Annexure P-6), the petitioners have not approached the respondents seeking benefit on par with the persons whose names have been considered and who are stated to be juniors to the petitioners. In this regard, necessary representation or demand has not been made by the petitioners. If the petitioners demand such inclusion of their names with reference to Memorandum dated 18.8.2012 (Annexure P-6), the respondents are directed to consider the same.

Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

December 08, 2016.

sandeep sethi

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.