

134

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-6885-2018

Date of decision-19.03.2018

Karamjit Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. J.S.Khiva, 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 the claim of the petitioner for recalling/re-instating him in service as the similarly situated persons who were discharged with the petitioner were recalled in the year 2013.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that case of the petitioner is covered by the judgment passed by this Court in CWP-4377-2018 titled as “***Joginder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others***” decided on 22.02.2018 (Annexure P-15). He further states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2- Director General of Police-cum-Commandant General Punjab Home Guards and Director Civil Defence, Punjab, Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 10.01.2018 (Annexure P-14) in the light of Annexure P-15.

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-cum-Commandant General Punjab Home Guards and Director Civil Defence, Punjab, Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 10.01.2018 (Annexure P-14) in the light of Annexure P-15 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 to him or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

19.03.2018

vanita

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