

119

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-9496-2018

Date of decision-02.05.2018

Jagir Singh and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.J.S.Mohri, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 mandamus directing the respondents to count the daily wage service of the petitioners rendered before their respective regularization as qualifying service and permit the petitioners to continue in old GPF scheme.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that case of the petitioners is covered by order dated 04.11.2015 passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Review Petition(C) No.2038-2013 in SLP-23578-2012, titled as “**State of Punjab and others Vs. Harbans Lal**” (Annexure P-7) and order dated 09.05.2016, passed by this Court in Review Application No.143-2016 in CWP-24472-2015 titled as “**Constable Rajesh Kumar and others Vs. State of Punjab and another**” (Annexure P-13). 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 Police Head Quarter, Sector-9,

Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 27.12.2017 (Annexure P-16) in the light of Annexures P-7 and P-13.

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 General of Police, Punjab Police Head Quarter, Sector-9, Chandigarh to consider and decide the representation dated 27.12.2017 (Annexure P-16) in the light of Annexures P-7 and P-13 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 petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible to them or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

02.05.2018

vanita

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