

101

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

CWP-27268-2017

Date of decision-06.03.2018

Pawan Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Manu K.Bhandari, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 consider and appoint the petitioner as Constable as per Standing Order No.1 dated 21.01.2002 (Annexure P-4).

Learned counsel states that case of the petitioner is covered by Clause 6.1 of Standing Order No.1/2002 of Punjab Police Dog Squad (Annexure P-4). 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, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the justice demand notice dated 06.04.2017 (Annexure P-7) in view of Annexure P-4.

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.2- Director General of Police, Punjab, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and

decide the justice demand notice dated 06.04.2017 (Annexure P-7) in view of Annexure P-4 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

06.03.2018

vanita

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