

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

**CWP-1453-2019(O&M)
Date of decision-21.01.2019**

Seema Singla

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Roopak Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, D.A.G., Haryana
for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of an appropriate writ, in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to hold fresh enquiry in view of contradictory reports (Annexures P-1 and P-3).

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that at this stage, he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to respondent No.3- Deputy Commissioner, Nuh, District Nuh to consider and hold fresh enquiry in view of contradictory reports dated 09.03.2015 (Annexure P-1) and report dated 02.07.2018 (Annexure P-3)expeditiously.

Heard.

A complete set of paper book has been handed over to

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, D.A.G., Haryana in the Court today.

Without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to conduct fresh enquiry and pass an appropriate order as per law after considering both the reports (Annexures P-1 and P-3) and associating the petitioner in the enquiry within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the claim made by the petitioner is admissible to her, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to her, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the claim made by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

21.01.2019

ps-I

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