

113-A

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

CWP No.6390 of 2017

Date of Decision : 28.03.2017

Sushil Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Ashok Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

The claim of the petitioner is that when he had to opt for a station during the transfer drive he could not opt for the most optimum station because the same was not reflected on the website due to some bug in the system of the respondents and in similar cases by order Annexure P-3 the respondents gave relief to similarly situated persons.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in this regard the petitioner has also moved a Representation dated 23.01.2017 (Annexure P-5) and at this stage he would be satisfied if the same is decided by the respondent No.1 by passing a speaking order thereon within any reasonable time.

I find this to be a fair submission. In the circumstances, this petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.1 to decide the

said representation by passing a speaking order thereon within a period of

two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

March 28, 2017
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	-	Yes/No
Whether reportable	-	Yes/No