

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

**CWP No. 11148 of 2018
Date of decision: 4.5.2018**

Navrattan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The limited grievance that the petitioner has is; that his study leave was approved under Rules 8.133, 8.119 and 8.137, whereas, his leave for a period of 394 days, rather than Rule 8.137, ought to have been dealt with under Rule 8.126. He purports to have repeatedly represented to the respondents in this regard. But to no avail. Even the legal notice, dated 10.1.2018 (Annexure P-6), the respondents have been served with, has failed to evoke any response.

That being so, the petition is disposed of, at this stage, only with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner, as also his legal notice, dated 10.1.2018 (Annexure P-6), within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order. And pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. In the event the claim of the petitioner is declined, the respondent authority shall pass a comprehensive order, assigning reasons in support thereof.

4.5.2018
AK Sharma

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

**(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE**

YES
NO