

117

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

CWP-16152-2018

Date of decision-06.07.2018

Baljit Singh and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. J.S.Mohri, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 daily wage service of the petitioners rendered before their respective regularization as qualifying service and consequently permit the petitioners to continue in the old GPF Scheme.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the claim of the petitioners is squarely covered by the judgment passed in CWP-2371-2010 titled as “**Harbans Lal Vs. State of Punjab and others**”, decided on 31.08.2010 (Annexure P-6) and CWP-10376-2014 titled as “**Subhash Chand and others Vs. State of Punjab and another**”, decided on 30.03.2016 (Annexure P-8). 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, Punjab Police Headquarters, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 23.05.2018 (Annexure P-10) in

the light of Annexures P-6 and P-8.

Heard.

In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Director General of Police, Punjab, Punjab Police Headquarters, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 23.05.2018 (Annexure P-10) in the light of Annexures P-6 and P-8 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

06.07.2018

vanita

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