

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

**CWP No.7905 of 2022
Date of Decision:-20.04.2022**

Ram Kumar Kapoor and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Nirmal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though in the present petition, the quashing of para 3 of the letter dated 15.12.2011 as well as the instruction dated 06.1.2015 have been challenged but the petitioners are not pressing the said prayer for the reason that despite the existence of the same, this Court has already granted the relief as being claimed by the petitioners while passing order in CWP No.7239 of 2015 and other connected cases, decided on 18.12.2019.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the relief as extended to the petitioners in CWP No.7239 of 2015, has not been extended to the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners were not the party to the said writ petition whereas as per the settled principle of law settled by Division Bench of this Court in ***CWP No. 4382 of 2002*** titled as ***Satbir***

Singh Vs. State of Haryana, decided on **21.03.2002**, the employees, who are covered by the settled question of law, are to be extended relief rather than forcing them to approach the Court time and again.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though all the petitioners have made representations but one representation dated 23.7.2021 filed by Purshotam Lal, raising the same plea, has been appended as Annexure P-7 and the petitioner will be satisfied in case a time bound direction is given to the respondent authorities to decide the same by passing an appropriate speaking order.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents and raises no objection in deciding the same by passing an appropriate speaking order in a time bound manner.

Learned State counsel submits that in the present case, the judgment in **Labh Singh Dhaliwal's** case has not attained the finality as the same is pending consideration before the Division Bench and even the contempt petitions are also pending for consideration and in the contempt petitions, the direction has been given by the Division Bench to adjourn the same but still the State has no objection in deciding the representation dated 23.7.2021 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Without going into the merits of the case or the claim being made by the petitioner in the present petition or in the representation, the respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation dated 23.7.2021 (Annexure P-7) within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of

certified copy of this order.

It is made clear that in case the plea of the petitioner, namely, Purshotam Lal is accepted, the same be implemented qua the other petitioners as well.

April 20, 2022
Vijay Asija

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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