

110

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-8148-2018

Date of decision-03.04.2018

Prince

Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. M.K.Dogra, 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 quashing the impugned orders dated 07.06.2016 and 22.06.2016 passed by respondent Nos.2 and 3 (Annexures P-9 and P-10) and for directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment in the light of Government Notification dated 21.11.2002 (Annexure P-12) and instructions dated 18.07.2005 (Annexure P-13)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.1- Principal Secretary, Department of Irrigation, Civil Secretariat-1, Punjab, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 26.07.2017 (Annexure P-11) in the light of notification dated 21.11.2002 and instructions dated 18.07.2005 (Annexures P-12 and P-13 respectively).

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.1- Principal Secretary, Department of Irrigation, Civil Secretariat-1, Punjab, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 26.07.2017 (Annexure P-11) in the light of notification dated 21.11.2002 and instructions dated 18.07.2005 (Annexures P-12 and P-13 respectively) 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

03.04.2018

vanita

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