

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

Sr. No.104

CWP No.4092 of 2016

Date of decision: 03.05.2016

Santosh Kumar and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that after filing of the present petition the relief as claimed in the present petition qua petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 has been granted by the respondents, rendering the present petition infructuous qua them.

Ordered accordingly.

So far as the Petitioner No.2 is concerned, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that at this stage, he would be satisfied if the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.4 to take a decision on the legal notice dated 04.02.2016 (Annexure P-13), issued on behalf of the petitioners qua petitioner No.2.

I find the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners to be reasonable.

Accordingly, at this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.4 to take a decision on the legal notice dated 04.02.2016 (Annexure P-13), qua petitioner No.2, by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to petitioner No.2, preferably within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to petitioner No.2 and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of petitioner No.2, he would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 03, 2016
Jyoti 1