

126 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-13354-2018

Date of decision-24.05.2018

Ajay Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.K.Daaria, Advocate for the petitioners.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

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 service rendered by the petitioners on the post of SPOs as qualifying service for the purpose of seniority for the post of Constables.

On the oral request of learned counsel for the petitioners, Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.4.

Registry is directed to amend the memo of parties accordingly.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that case of the petitioners is covered by judgment rendered by this Court in CR-2295-2010, titled as “**Constable Rajinder Kumar Vs. State of Punjab and others**” decided on 06.09.2010 (Annexure P-5) and another judgment passed in CWP-24472-2015, titled as “**Constable Rajesh Kumar and others Vs. State**

of Punjab and another” decided on 07.01.2016 (Annexure P-7). Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.4- Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to consider and decide the legal notice dated 06.04.2006 (Annexure P-3) in the light of Annexures P-5 and P-7.

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.4- Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to consider and decide the legal notice dated 06.04.2006 (Annexure P-3) in the light of Annexures P-5 and P-7 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 petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible to them or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

24.05.2018

vanita

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