

**CWP No. 18589 of 2018
DECIDED ON: JULY 30, 2018**

JAGDISH PRASAD

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought a direction to respondents to consider and decide his claim set out in the legal notice dated 25.01.2018 (P-1).

2. The contention of learned counsel is that though petitioner served a legal notice dated 25.01.2018 (P-1) upon the respondents but despite the fact that a period of more than five months has elapsed neither any response has been received nor any conscious decision has been taken by the respondents. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case a direction is issued to respondents to decide the afore-said legal notice (P-1) in a time bound manner.

3. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents, to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 25.01.2018

(P-1) and to take a conscious decision in accordance with law, rules and regulations as well as instructions issued by the government from time to time, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

4. However, if petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available under the law including to approach this Court.

JULY 30, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>