

CWP No. 18438 of 2017
DECIDED ON: OCTOBER 04, 2017

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Parveen Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners have sought for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant 1st ACP, 2nd ACP and 3rd ACP on completion of 8, 16 and 24 years of service, in view of Haryana Civil Services (Assured Career Progression) Rules, 2014 with all consequential benefits with further direction to respondents to consider and decide the representation dated July 23, 2016 (P-2).

2. At the very outset learned counsel for the petitioners submit that he feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the representation dated July 23, 2016 (P-2) within a time bound manner.

3. A glance at the instant petition transpires that there are eight petitioners/retirees who joined on different dates, regularised on different dates, retired on different dates and could be entitled to the afore-said ACPs on different dates. But all these factors have been intermingled in the petition as well as in the representation (P-2), which creates confusion.

4. Thus, the instant petition is disposed of with direction to petitioners to file a separate representations within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, which shall be dealt with and dispose of by respondent No.2 within a period of three months from the date of filing of such representation(s); that too, by passing a speaking order.

5. However, in case petitioners still feel aggrieved of any order of the afore-said authority, they shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

OCTOBER 04, 2017
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*