

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

Date of decision: 23.02.2017

CWP No.3651 of 2017

Dalwara Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

Food Corporation of India & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Kamal Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

The statutory appeal against the adverse order is pending for the last 9 months before the 3rd respondent designated as the Appellate Authority. The petitioner has been compulsorily retired from service against which he has appealed.

Learned counsel submits on the strength of S.S.Rathore Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, (1989) 4 SCC 582; AIR 1990 SC 10 (Para.17) that in cases of redressal of grievances in the hands of the departmental authorities, the approach of the Appellate Authority should be to dispose of appeals or revisions filed under service rules as expeditiously as possible. Ordinarily, a period of 3 to 6 months should be the outer limit. That would discipline the system and keep the public servant away from a protracted period of litigation.

In view of this, a direction to the 3rd respondent deserves to be issued to decide the appeal filed by the petitioner in no more than two months from the date certified copy of this order is brought to the notice of the Appellate Authority by the petitioner. The Appellate Authority would

offer an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and thereafter pass a reasoned order on each of the grounds taken in challenge to the order of compulsory retirement. The same be conveyed promptly.

With these observations and directions, the petition stands disposed of.

23.02.2017
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*