

128

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

CWP-7622-2018

Date of decision-27.04.2018

Krishan Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Manish Manchanda, Advocate for
Mr. Sunil Polist, 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 of order dated 29.12.2017 (Annexure P-4) whereby the claim dated 10.04.2017 (Annexure P-2) of the petitioner has been rejected by respondent No.3 and further directing the respondents to decide legal notice (Annexure P-5).

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.2-Director, Directorate of Haryana State Transport, Sector-17, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 25.01.2017 (Annexure P-5).

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-Director, Directorate of Haryana State Transport, Sector-17, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 25.01.2017 (Annexure P-5) 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

27.04.2018

vanita

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