

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(133)

CWP No. 33921 of 2019

Date of Decision : 21.11.2019

Balbir Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Ganesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, 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 respondent(s) to grant benefit of selection grade w.e.f. 01.01.1996 instead of 01.08.2000.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that case of the petitioners is covered by judgments passed by this Court in CWP-8082-2001, titled as “**R.K.Verma and others Vs. State of Haryana and another**” decided on 01.12.2010 (Annexure P-1), LPA-951-2012, titled as “**State of Haryana and another Vs. R.K.Verma and others**” decided on 31.10.2012 (Annexure P-2) and CWP-4429-2014, titled as “**Nafe Chand and others Vs. State of Haryana and others**” decided on 10.03.2014 (Annexure P-3). Further, he states that at this stage he would be satisfied, if

a direction is issued to respondent No.1-Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, Department of School Education, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 20.08.2019 (Annexure P-6) in the light of judgments attached as Annexures P-1, P-2 and P-3.

In view of the above, without commenting upon the merits of the case or the claim raised in this writ petition at this stage, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1-Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, Department of School Education, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to consider and decide the legal notice dated 20.08.2019 (Annexure P-6) in the light of judgments attached as Annexures P- 1, P-2 and P-3 within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of this 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 or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

November 21, 2019
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes
Whether reportable? No