

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

CWP No.22182 of 2012
Date of decision: 04.04.2018

Raghubir Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. RK Doon, AAG, Haryana.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

In the wake of the stand set out in paragraph 4 of the reply filed on behalf of the respondents, learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the petition qua petitioners No.1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 32 & 36 has been rendered infructuous. And, for petitioner No.12 has since retired from service, petitioner No.28 has been dismissed being convicted in a criminal case, and petitioner No.35 having been issued a chargesheet under Rule 7 of the Haryana Civil Services, the benefit of 1st and 2nd ACP could not be extended. However, the claim of six petitioners i.e. No.5, 6, 15, 18, 25 & 27, has been declined for they failed to qualify the requisite departmental examination of Kanungo. Whereas, the ACRs of petitioners No.16, 22, 31, 33 & 34 were not available, and as regards petitioners No.14, 29 & 30, they never applied through proper channel.

Learned State counsel submits that except petitioners No.12, 28 & 35, claim of rest of the petitioners shall be considered/reconsidered by the respondent-authorities. And appropriate orders, in accordance with law, shall be passed within a period of eight weeks from today.

That being so, counsel for the petitioners submits that the petition be disposed of in the wake of the statement of the learned State counsel.

Disposed of in the above terms. This Court is sanguine that in the event the claim of the above petitioners is declined, the respondent-authorities shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reason in support thereof.

04.04.2018
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES
NO