

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(220)

CWP No. 29209 of 2018

Date of Decision : 30.11.2022

Sunder Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that many similarly situated employees have been given the benefit, which is being sought by the petitioner and the details of the same have already been mentioned by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 16.07.2018 (Annexure P-5). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the respondents are disputing the claim of the petitioner for grant of regularization under the Policy of the year 2003 or 2004 as the case may be, but nothing has been mentioned by the respondents qua the grant of benefit to the similarly situated employees hence, the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, if respondents are directed to decide the legal notice dated 16.07.2018 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner by passing an appropriate speaking order in a time bound manner.

Learned counsel for the respondents raises no objection in

deciding the legal notice dated 16.07.2018 (Annexure P-5) in a time bound manner by passing an appropriate speaking order.

In view of the pleadings in the present petition, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the claim being made by the petitioner in the legal notice, respondent No. 2 is directed to decide the legal notice dated 16.07.2018 (Annexure P-5), by passing a speaking order within a period of eight weeks from the receipt of copy of this order.

Present writ petition stands disposed of.

November 30, 2022
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No