

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

CWP No.97 of 2017

Date of Decision.11.01.2017

Krishan Dev

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Surinder Kumar Daaria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that vide letter dated 20.09.2016 (Annexure P-3), Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Gurgaon called upon the petitioner to submit identity card for the post of Panch got prepared through wrong means in the office. The same had been responded through Annexure P-4 but there is no decision taken thereon.

He further submits that in view of the aforementioned fact, salary of the petitioner has not been paid. He would be satisfied in case the appropriate direction is issued to the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Gurgaon to decide the reply filed in pursuance to the letter Annexure P-3.

In view of the aforementioned, the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Gurgaon is directed to decide the reply filed and received under Annexure P-4 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and shall pass speaking order in accordance with law. If the reply is not filed, the petitioner shall be at

liberty to file the same afresh and will be decided within the aforementioned

period as indicated above.

With the aforementioned observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

January 11, 2017
Pankaj*

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