

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

(261)

CWP-1161-2022

Date of decision: - 04.12.2023

Renu**....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to calculate the proper marks of the petitioner for her height, as 13 marks instead of 12 marks in physical measure test for the post of Female Constable under Advertisement No.08/2015 Category No.2.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a detailed representation dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-10) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case respondent No.3 considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said representation dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-10), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two months from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to consider the representation dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-10) filed by the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case respondent No.3 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case, respondent No.3 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

December 04, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No