

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

CWP No.2149 of 2018  
Date of decision: 01.02.2018

Karambir Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

**ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)**

Notice of motion.

Mr. Siddharth Sanwaria, DAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copies furnished.

For the nature of order I propose to pass in the matter, no formal written statements/counter affidavits on behalf of the respondents are indeed necessary, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is being disposed of finally.

Petitioners competed for selection against the posts of Clerks, in the year 2012, in Haryana Police and were appointed as such. Order dated 29.09.2016, issued by respondent No.2, required those employed as Clerk to clear the type test. For the candidates qualifying the said test were not only entitled to certain pecuniary benefits, but also for promotion to the post of Assistant. The departmental promotion committee held a test on 01.09.2016 and of 22 candidates only 5, including the petitioners, qualified. Resultantly, petitioner No.2 was given five increments and his pay was also revised. Similar benefits were extended to other petitioners as well. It is alleged that even the names of the petitioners were sent for consideration for further

promotion. But as, one of the candidates, namely, Ramesh Kumar, Clerk, had failed to qualify the type test, despite having availed 15 chances, the department decided to constitute another committee to re-examine his typing proficiency. However, he failed again. But surprisingly, vide order dated 13.12.2017 (Annexure P3), the results declared on 29.09.2016 were withdrawn by the respondents. The petitioners alleged to have represented to respondent No.2 vide representation dated 18.12.2017 (Annexure P4) to withdraw the order dated 13.12.2017. For they had qualified the test and had even been extended the consequential benefits. Thus, it is urged that the order dated 13.12.2017 is wholly erroneous. Further, even though a considerable time has elapsed, but their claim/representation (Annexure P4) continues to await consideration by the competent authority.

In response, learned State counsel submits that the grievance/claim of the petitioners, as also their representation dated 18.12.2017 (Annexure P4), shall be considered and dealt with within a period of two weeks from today. And an appropriate order, in accordance with law, shall be passed and communicated to the petitioners as also to their counsel.

That being so, the petition, at this stage, is disposed of in the above terms. However, in the event the claim of the petitioners is declined, the authority shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons in support thereof.

01.02.2018  
Rajan

**( Arun Palli )**  
**Judge**

Whether speaking / reasoned:  
Whether Reportable:

YES  
NO