

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

CWP No.34845 of 2019
Date of Decision : 29.11.2019.

Kuldeep Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate for the petitioners.

B.S.WALIA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the writ petition is for the issuance of a writ of Mandamus for directing the respondents to fill up all vacancies/posts of PGT (Computer Science) by preparing waiting list from the result declared Annexure P/5 dated 25.11.2018.

2. On query as to whether any demand had been made before the respondents in respect of the claim which is the subject matter of the writ petition, learned counsel answered in negative.

3. The petitioners have invoked the jurisdiction of this Court without having made any demand which is a sine-qua non for seeking the issuance of a writ of Mandamus as per settled law. Relevant extract of the decision in **Surya College of Education versus Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa and another 2013(4) SCT**

393 is reproduced as under:

“10. In view of the above, the only question of law that falls for consideration of this court is, whether it is sine qua non for the petitioner to put his/her demand for justice before the concerned authority, before approaching this court, seeking a writ of mandamus.

11. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any averment in this regard or any document to the effect that before approaching this court by way of instant petition, any right of the petitioner has been infringed and thereafter, the petitioner approached the respondent authorities, raising its grievance by making necessary representation, demanding the consideration of the rights of the petitioner and seeking redressal of its grievance. Learned counsel for the petitioner also could not point out any difficulty, which might have been faced by the petitioner, while not approaching the respondent authorities by making the appropriate representation.

12. In view of what has been observed above, this court feels no hesitation to conclude that the necessary requirement of law has not been fulfilled by the petitioner, before approaching this court. Before seeking a writ of mandamus, the petitioner was under legal obligation to show infringement or denial of any of its rights and thereafter, moving necessary representation to the concerned authority pointing out the infringement or denial of its rights, besides seeking redressal of its grievance, followed by inaction on the part of respondent authorities. Since the petitioner has failed to satisfy the above said requirements of law, the instant petition is not maintainable in the present form.

*13. The view taken by this court finds support from the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Amrit Lal Berry, K.N. Kapur and others v. Collector of Central Excise Central Revenue and others, 1975(4) SCC 714**. The relevant observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court read as under:-*

*" In the petition of K.N. Kapur and others, we do not even find an assertion that any representation was made against any violation of a petitioner's right. Hence, the rule recognised by this Court in **Kamini Kumar Das v. State of West Bengal, AIR 1972 Supreme Court 2060** at p.2065 that a demand for justice and its refusal must precede the filing of a petition asking for direction or Writ of Mandamus, would also operate against the petitioners."*

14. Respectfully following the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Amrit Lal Berry, K.N. Kapur and others case (supra), it is unhesitatingly held that the present petition is misconceived and is not maintainable in the present form, at this stage. I say so because the learned counsel for the petitioner has failed in laying down the basic foundation of the case in view of the law noticed hereinabove.

15. However, lest this order is misunderstood, it is made clear that the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the

respondent authorities by moving the necessary representation raising its demand for justice and seeking redressal of its grievance. Further, it goes without saying that if the petitioner approaches the respondent authorities by way of an appropriate representation or justice demand notice, the competent authority shall consider the claim of the petitioner, dispassionately and expeditiously, passing an appropriate order, in accordance with law.”

4. In the light of the position as noted above, learned counsel for the petitioners prays for permission to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to file a comprehensive representation before the competent authority.

5. In view of the statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, the writ petition is permitted to be withdrawn with liberty to file a comprehensive representation before the appropriate authorities.

(B.S.WALIA)
JUDGE

29.11.2019.

rajesh.k.khurana

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No