

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

CWP No.12289 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.08.2020

Rahul

...Petitioner

Versus

UT Chandigarh and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present: Mr. Saransh Sabharwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. MADAAN, J. (Oral)

Case taken up through video conferencing.

This petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus has been filed by petitioner Rahul, aged about 26 years, against respondents i.e. UT Chandigarh through its Advisor and the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh.

By way of filing the present civil writ petition, the petitioner contends that his father Sh. Tej Pal was working as a Safai Karamchari in the Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, however, unfortunately, he expired on 11.02.2020 while still in service, leaving behind his wife and children. The petitioner being one of the sons of Sh. Tej Pal deceased had applied for grant of employment on compassionate grounds, however, his such request has not been considered.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Abhinav Sood, Addl. PP, UT Chandigarh and Mr. Aditya Jain, accept notices on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 respectively.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the respondents to consider his representation (Annexure P3) within a fixed time frame.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondents state that the respondents would comply with any direction issued by this Court in that regard.

Thus, keeping in view the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, response given by learned counsel for the respondents and to avoid unnecessary litigation between the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the representation of the petitioner Annexure P-3 and decide the same by passing a speaking order within a period of two months from today. However, if after passing of such order, the petitioner still feels aggrieved, then he may take recourse to legal remedy, if so advised in accordance with law.

20.08.2020

sumit.k

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

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