

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

215

CWP No.26850 of 2016

Date of Decision : 12.02.2020

Amrit Lal Sharma

....Petitioner

v/s

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Kshitij Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Avinash Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Sole argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the impugned order (Annexure P-15) dated 02.09.2016, rejecting the request of the petitioner for change of cadre from Circle Office to Head Office as UDC with retrospective effect is a cryptic and non speaking order as the same merely records that request for reconsideration of change of cadre from Circle Office to Head Office cadre with retrospective effect had been considered and not found feasible for acceptance.

[2] Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the circumstances, the impugned order (Annexure P-15) dated 02.09.2016 is liable to be set aside and the relief prayed for granted.

[3] Learned counsel for respondent No.2 on the other hand has not been able to controvert the plea of learned counsel for the petitioner of the impugned order being cryptic and non speaking. However, learned counsel for

respondent No.2 states that liberty be granted to the respondents to pass fresh order, in accordance with law.

[4] The same satisfies learned counsel for the petitioner.

[5] Accordingly, in the light of the position as noted above, impugned order (Annexure P-15) dated 02.09.2016 is *set aside*, while granting liberty to the respondents to pass a fresh order, in accordance with law, after complying with the principles of natural justice.

[6] Writ Petition stands ***disposed of*** in the above terms.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

February 12, 2020
'Rajneesh'

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