

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

116

CWP No.24910 of 2017

Date of decision: 02.11.2017

Rajender Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr.Rakesh Sobti, Advocate, for the petitioner.

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks issuance of directions for decision of his mercy petition dated 18.04.2009 (Annexure P-4), submitted to respondent No.1, as it has been alleged that the petitioner had been called for hearing on 21.01.2015 (Annexure P-5) for the said purpose.

The issue in the said mercy petition is against the stoppage of 2 annual increments which were imposed upon the petitioner, who is now working as Sub-Inspector. Vide the impugned order dated 24.09.2007 (Annexure P-1), stoppage of 2 annual increments, with permanent effect, were imposed by respondent No.3, in pursuance of the charge-sheet and the departmental enquiry initiated. The petitioner had been unsuccessful in appeal and revision before respondents No.4 & 2, who dismissed the same vide orders dated 22.05.2008 (Annexure P-2) and 21.01.2009 (Annexure P-3), respectively.

Counsel, accordingly, submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if the mercy petition dated 18.04.2009 (Annexure P-4), though not filed under any statutory provision, be disposed of, within a time-bound frame, as considerable period has expired since the filing of the same.

Notice of motion.

Ms.Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copy of the paperbook has been supplied to her.

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

116

CWP No.24910 of 2017

-2-

Keeping in view the fact that respondent No.1 is yet to take a decision on the said petition, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by calling upon the respondents to file reply.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case or the entitlement of the petitioner, as such, but in view of the fact that the petitioner had been called for personal hearing, as per Annexure P-5, it would be appropriate if respondent No.1 takes a decision on the petition dated 18.04.2009 (Annexure P-4), if not already decided, within a period of 2 months from the receipt of a certified copy of this order and convey the same to the petitioner, thereafter.

02.11.2017

Sailesh

**(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*