

119.

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

**CWP-8944-2022**

Date of Decision: 29.04.2022

JAGDISH PRASAD AND ORS

.... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present:- Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

----

**JAISHREE THAKUR.J (Oral)**

This is a petition that has been filed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to re-instate the petitioners in service on the post of Home Guard.

Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners would contend that the petitioners were working as Home Guards since 2014 and without following proper procedure as mentioned in Section 20(3) of the Haryana Home Guard Rules, 1980, their services were terminated without passing any written order and even no opportunity of hearing was given to them. It is further contended that similarly situated persons are still working as Home Guards with the respondent department. For the said grievance, the petitioners have also filed applications/representations dated 08.04.2022 (Annexures P-8 to P-11), but no action has been taken thereon. He would

submit that the petitioners would be satisfied in case the said applications/representations are decided in a time bound manner.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the respondents will look into the matter and will take a decision on the applications/representations of the petitioners.

Let sufficient number of copies of the complete paper book be supplied to him during the course of day.

Without commenting on merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the applications/representations dated 08.04.2022 (Annexures P-8 to P-11) of the petitioners, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order, in accordance with law, and convey the decision to the petitioners. In case of failure to do so, the officer responsible for the lapse would be liable to costs of Rs.20,000/- from his personal pocket, to be deposited with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Advocates Welfare Fund.

**29.04.2022**

sanjeev

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No