

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

**CWP-10198-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.05.2017**

Rajender Parshad Yadav

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr. Sandep Kumar Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

Petitioner claims benefit of ACP for 8, 16 and 24 years in place of 10, 20 and 30 years. Petitioner retired from service on 30.4.2017. Petitioner claims the benefit of judgment in Om Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and another, CWP 17496 of 2014 decided on 18.3.2017 (Annexure P3). Petitioner has already submitted a representation dated 26.3.2017 (Annexure P4).

The short prayer made at this stage is to direct the respondents to consider the representation dated 26.3.2017 (Annexure P4) and decide the same in the light of the judgment of Om Parkash's case (supra).

In these circumstances, without issuing notice to the respondents, the present writ petition is disposed of with directions to respondent nos. 2 and 3 to consider and decide representation dated 26.3.2017 (Annexure P4) of the petitioner within two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

12.05.2017

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking/ reasoned:

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No