

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

110

**CWP No.16207 of 2020
Date of decision:5.10.2020**

RAJESH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Vs

HARYANA POWER UTILITIES & ORS

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Ms.Sangita Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that CWP No. 2522 of 2008, filed by the petitioner was allowed by this Court on 9.7.2009, thereby, quashing the order dated 23.1.2008. Respondents were directed to give posting to the petitioner in terms of his appointment letter within a period of one month from that date. It was also made clear that the petitioner will be entitled to salary from the date of his joining duties. Vide order dated 11.8.2009, petitioner was allowed to join his duty in compliance of the aforesaid order.

Petitioner was selected in the selection process arising out of advertisement No.8/2006. He was found to be 30% permanently disabled. The offer of appointment was cancelled vide order dated 23.1.2008. The said order was quashed by this Court in CWP No. 2522 of 2008 on 9.7.2009.

The grievance of the petitioner is that despite his representation, service benefits arising from his joining w.e.f. 14.8.2007 have not been accorded to him. Amit Kumar, who was appointed as Assistant Lineman in view of later advertisement No.04/2008 and appointed in the year 2017 i.e. 31.1.2017 has already been given his financial benefits including pay fixation under 7th Pay Commission and 1st Assured Career Progression increments, but in case of the petitioner, the accrued benefits have not been given to him.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that the present writ petition be considered as representation of the petitioner in continuation of the representations already moved by him before the respondents.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of issuing notice at this stage, as no order prejudicial to the interest of respondents is being passed.

In view of above, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, respondent No.2 is directed to treat the

present petition as representation on behalf of the petitioner and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

October 05, 2020

anita

Whether reasoned/speaking

Whether reportable

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No