

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

CWP-1215-2022

Date of Decision: 24.01.2022

BHUPAL SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Sushil Sheoran, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, D.A.G., Haryana.

(Presence marked through Video Conference)

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner herein, *inter alia*, seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondent No.2 to grant him extension of two years in service up to 60 years of age as per applicable guidelines dated 05.08.2011 (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that qua his aforesaid grievance, petitioner submitted a representation dated 07.07.2021 (Annexure P-2). The Welfare Officer i.e. respondent No.3 has though recommended his case, but the same is not being considered. He further submits that similarly situated employee namely, Singh Ram, Clerk has been granted the benefit of extension of two years in service up to the age of 60 years vide an administrative order dated 15.02.2019.

3. Heard.

4. It appears that despite the petitioner having been given the representation to seek parity with similarly situated employee to seek extension of service from 58 to 60 years, he has been left high and dry as neither, for the past 5 months, a decision has been taken on the representation nor extension is being granted to him, compelling him to approach this Court through the instant writ petition.

5. Notice of motion.

GURPREET KAUR
2022.01.25 12:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

6. Learned State counsel, on advance service, joins proceedings and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State of Haryana and submits that the pending representation dated 07.07.2021 (Annexure P-2) shall be decided, either way, by passing a speaking order, giving reasons thereof, in case the petitioner is found not entitled to parity with similarly situated another employee as has been claimed by him.

7. Given the nature of order being passed, there is no necessity to seek return by any of the respondents as no further proceedings and/or pleadings are required.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority to look into the grievance of the petitioner as per representation dated 07.07.2021 (Annexure P-2) and keeping in view the contention raised in the present petition by treating the same as supplementary representation and take a decision, in accordance with law.

9. Let the needful be done before 31.01.2022, failing which, the petitioner shall be allowed to continue in service till the decision on his pending representation.

10. Disposed of accordingly.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

24.01.2022
gurpreet

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