

112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-10392-2018

Date of decision-27.04.2018

Balbir Singh

Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Jasbir Singh Mohri, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to count the daily wage service of the petitioner rendered before his respective regularization as qualifying service.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that case of the petitioner is covered by judgment passed by this Court in CWP-2371-2010 titled as “**Harbans Lal Vs. State of Punjab and others**” decided on 31.08.2010 (Annexure P-7) and another judgment passed in CWP-29940-2017 titled as “**Ajit Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**” decided on 02.02.2018 (Annexure P-11). Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2-Director General of Police, Punjab Police Head Quarter, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 27.02.2018 (Annexure P-13) in view of Annexures P-7 and P-11.

Heard.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Director General of Police, Punjab Police Head Quarter, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 27.02.2018 (Annexure P-13) in view of Annexures P-7 and P-11 within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible to him or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

27.04.2018

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No