

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

**CWP-10598-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision : 24.07.2020**

Shyam Sunder

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN J. (ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing in the light of the pandemic COVID-19 situation and as per instructions.

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for the issuance of a directions to respondent Nos.4 and 5 to grant 2nd ACP w.e.f. 01.12.1996 and respondent Nos.2 and 3 to grant 3rd ACP w.e.f. 01.12.2006 to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the ACPs were not granted on the ground that the petitioner had been nominated as an accused in one FIR, which stands cancelled now. Further submits that at this stage he would be satisfied, if a direction is issued to the respondents, to consider and decide the legal notice dated dated 03.03.2020 (Annexure P-9).

Heard.

Having regard to the prayer made and without adverting to the

merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the concerned respondents to consider and decide the legal notice dated 03.03.2020 (Annexure P-9) 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 benefit claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed within a period of six weeks thereafter, in accordance with law. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.

24.07.2020
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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