

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

**CWP No.22198 of 2016
Date of decision: 24.10.2016**

Surjit Kaur

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Mohd. Yousaf, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)

Feeling aggrieved against the impugned communication dated 27.09.2016 (Annexure P-8), petitioner has approached this Court, by way of present writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of certiorari, for quashing the impugned communication.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset, submits that he does not intend to press the present writ petition for a writ in the nature of certiorari, for the time being. He further submits that when the genuine grievance of the petitioner was not being redressed, she approached respondent No.2 by way of self-contained representation dated 05.10.2016 (Annexure P-9) but the same is also pending decision. He also submits that petitioner will be satisfied in case respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner within a reasonable time.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the rights

of either of the parties, present writ petition is disposed of, with a direction to Director General of Police, Punjab-respondent No.2 to consider the grievance raised by the petitioner, which seems to be genuine, in her representation dated 05.10.2016 (Annexure P-9) and decide the same, at an early date by passing an appropriate order thereon, strictly in accordance with law but in any case within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, particularly numerous judgments in favour of the petitioner, including one passed by this Court vide order dated 11.11.2013 (Annexure P-3), respondent No.2 is directed that the observations made by all the Courts, while passing different orders deciding the civil litigation between the parties, shall also be kept in view, while passing an appropriate order. It is further directed that respondent No.2 shall remain totally uninfluenced by the impugned communication dated 27.09.2016 (Annexure P-8) and operation thereof shall also be kept in abeyance till an appropriate order is passed by respondent No.2. It is also directed that if any order passed by the respondent authorities goes against the petitioner, the same shall not be implemented for a period of three weeks, so as to enable the petitioner to challenge the same, if it is required, before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law.

With the abovesaid observations made and directions issued, instant writ petition stands disposed of.

[RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK]
JUDGE

24.10.2016
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No