

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

CWP No.20277 of 2017
Date of decision: 07.09.2017

Kamlesh Devi and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Jasmer Singh Rozera, Advocate for
Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the court, Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Kanwar, Advocate, Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana and Mr. DK Singal, Advocate accept notice on behalf of respondent No.1, respondent No.2 and respondent No.3, respectively.

For the nature of order, I propose to pass in the matter, no formal written statement(s)/counter-affidavit(s) is required to be filed on behalf of the respondents, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is being disposed of finally.

This is a petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, praying for a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the requisite amount as regards solatium and interest in terms of the decision of this Court in **M/s. Golden Iron and Steel Forging v. Union of India and other**, 2011(4) RCR 375 (Civil). Concededly, nothing is

placed on record to show that before institution of this petition, the petitioners ever served the respondent authorities with any representation or notice as regards their claim.

Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that let this petition itself be treated as representation and the respondent authorities be directed to consider and decide the same within a specified time.

In response, learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that the claim of the petitioners shall be considered by the competent authority and the appropriate orders in accordance with law shall be passed.

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that let this petition be disposed of in terms of the decision, dated 06.09.2017, rendered by this Court in CWP No.17010 of 2017 [**Vinod Kumar v. State of Haryana and others**].

Accordingly, the petition is disposed of in terms of the decision of this Court in Vinod Kumar's case (supra).

September 7, 2017
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:

YES

Whether Reportable:

NO