

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

Date of decision: 19.01.2018

CWP No.13719 of 2015 (O&M)

Sher Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner will sit with the competent authority and explain from the hand written summary of case produced before this Court as to why the impugned order deserves to be reviewed on the administrative side. If the flaws are patent, then they can always be remedied in the first instance by the administrator himself although he has passed the order, which is subject matter of this petition. This is more so when the dispute is only one of calculation and not of applying any legal principle. The hand written summary of petitioner's case is taken on record as Mark-A. A copy of such summary has been handed over to Ms. Goyal for onward transmission to the competent authority.

2. The petitioner would file a typed copy of the same before the authority for him to review his order and pass a fresh one in the light of the reasons contained in the summary. The competent authority would call the

petitioner to his office and together they would sit and understand the case of the petitioner.

3. Let the exercise be carried out within two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. The final order in writing may be communicated to the petitioner within the same time frame. If the authority is of the same view as in the impugned order, he would record reasons so that the Court on challenge would know what has weighed in his mind to conclude the case in a particular way.

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

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE

19.01.2018

Vimal/manju

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*