

129

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

CWP-25107-2018

Date of decision-01.10.2018

Inderjit Singh

....Petitioner

Vs.

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

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 29.09.2015 (Annexure P-3) whereby the period under suspension from 25.06.2012 to 02.04.2013, regularized for the purpose of seniority alone and was not treated as duty period for all intents and purposes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioner was falsely implicated in FIR No.14 dated 25.06.2012 registered under Sections 7 and 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau, Rohtak and now stands acquitted vide judgment dated 28.07.2014 (Annexure P-1). Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2-Chief Engineer, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Rohtak to consider and decide the appeal dated 07.10.2015 (Annexure P-4) in the light of judgments passed by this Court in

CWP-14375-2003, titled as “**Shashi Kumar Vs. Uttri Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and another**”, 2005(1) SCT 576 and CWP-20271-2015, titled as “**Jagdish Lal Vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and others**”, 2017(3) SCT 211.

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- Chief Engineer, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Rohtak to consider and decide the appeal dated 07.10.2015 (Annexure P-4) in the light of aforesaid judgments and decide the same as per law 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 petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

01.10.2018

vanita

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