

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

**CWP No. 2166 of 2017
Date of Decision: 07.02.2017**

Tanveer Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Jagdeep Jaswal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The petitioner herein had applied for appointment to the post of Constable pursuant to an advertisement issued. However, his candidature has been rejected and appointment letter has not issued on account of his involvement in FIR No. 89 dated 15.05.2015.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the pendency of the said FIR would have no bearing on the issuance of appointment letter since the petitioner was a juvenile at that time. In this regard, reliance has been placed upon a judgment rendered by a Division Bench in ***LPA No. 1739 of 2014***, titled as ***Union of India and others vs. Alok Singh Yadav***, decided on 27.10.2014 and on Section 19 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000. The petitioner has already submitted a representation to the respondents-authorities seeking appointment under the said advertisement, however, to date, the said representation has not been decided. At present, limited prayer made is that the said representation be decided as expeditiously as possible.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Avinit Avasthi, AAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State.

Service is complete. Let three copies of the paper book be supplied to the counsel for the respondents-State during the course of the day.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and since the prayer is limited that said representation be decided as expeditiously as possible, without commenting on the merits of the case, this writ petition is disposed of by giving a direction to the petitioner to file a fresh and detailed representation before the respondents along with a certified copy of this order within a period of two weeks. On receipt of the said representation, the respondents are directed to decide the same by passing a speaking order preferably within a period of two months thereafter. In case, it is found that the claim of the petitioner is tenable, the needful be done within a period of one month thereafter.

Writ petition stands disposed of.

February 07, 2017
Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No