

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.14613 of 2017
DECIDED ON: July 11, 2017

ARUN KUMAR JOHAR

..PETITIONER...

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..RESPONDENTS...

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Ajey Bishnoi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (Oral)

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not claim any relief against respondent No.3 and his name be deleted from the array of respondents.

In view of the statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, name of respondent No.3 stands deleted from the array of respondents.

By virtue of instant civil writ petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Additional Director with retrospective effect i.e. from 30.10.2012, the date on which it became due.

The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that although the promotion of the petitioner has been approved by the Chief Minister,

Haryana on 30.10.2012 but the same has not so far been given to him by Principal Secretary, Information, Public Relations & Languages Department, Govt. of Haryana, which is absolutely against the principle of natural justice.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that though representation dated 01.05.2013 (Annexure P-5) was made to respondent No.1 and representation (Annexure P-6) was moved to the Chief Minister, Haryana but without passing any speaking order and dealing with submissions made in the aforesaid representations, the same have been simply filed vide letter dated 12.10.2015 (Annexure P-7).

The instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1-Principal Secretary, Information, Public Relations & Languages Department, Govt. of Haryana, Chandigarh to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his representations (Annexures P-5 and P-6) and take an appropriate action. It is expected that respondent No.1 shall give a deep consideration and pass a speaking order, that too, after hearing the petitioner patiently, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

July 11, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: Yes/No