

127

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

CWP-10835-2018

Date of decision-02.05.2018

Bachittar Singh

Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.Amit Arora, 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 decide the representation dated 15.03.2018 (Annexure P-3).

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that similarly situated persons have been allowed to join. Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2-Additional Director General of Police (Home Guards), Punjab Home Guards and Civil Defence Department, State Headquarters, Sector-17-C, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 15.03.2018 (Annexure P-3).

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-Additional Director General of Police (Home Guards), Punjab Home Guards

and Civil Defence Department, State Headquarters, Sector-17-C, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 15.03.2018 (Annexure P-3) 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

02.05.2018

vanita

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