

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

CWP No.34246 of 2019

Date of Decision : 02.12.2019.

Sudesh Malik

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S.Walia

Present: Mr. Ashish Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

B.S.WALIA, J. (Oral)

1. Sole prayer of the petitioner is for the issuance of a writ of Mandamus for directing the respondents to grant same pay-scale as has been granted to other similarly situated employees working on the same post in the department.

2. Learned counsel contends that claim of other similarly situated employees was allowed by this Court vide order Annexure P-5 dated 18.02.2009 in CWP No.3818 of 1992 but despite the petitioner having made a representation Annexure P/4 dated 29.10.2018, no decision has been taken on the same till date and that in the circumstances the petitioner would be satisfied if the writ petition is disposed of at this stage by directing respondent No.2 to consider and decide the claim as made in representation Annexure P/4 dated 29.10.2018 in accordance with law in a time bound manner.

2. Notice of motion. Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and states that he has no objection to the innocuous prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Without commenting on the merits of the claim or the entitlement of the petitioner to the relief claimed, the writ petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to consider and decide the claim made in representation Annexure P/4 dated 29.10.2018, as per rules as also the decision of this Court dated 18.02.2009, in CWP No.3818 of 1992, in case the same is applicable within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(B.S.WALIA)
JUDGE

02.12.2019.

rajesh.k.khurana

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No