

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

Sr. No.214

CWP No.8822 of 2013

Date of decision: 10.05.2016

R.P. Garg

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Ram Niwas Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kunal Mutheja, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

None for respondent No.4.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner 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 representation dated 07.09.2010 (Annexure P-6), submitted by the petitioner in the light of Memo No.1/13/2002-1A-II dated 05.05.2016.

I find the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner 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.1 to take a decision on the representation dated 07.09.2010 (Annexure P-6) submitted by the petitioner in the light of Memo No.1/13/2002-1A-II dated

05.05.2016, by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, 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 the petitioner and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioner, he would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 10, 2016

Jyoti 1