

CWP-2644-2023

-1-

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

(114-3)

CWP-2644-2023

Date of decision:- 18.04.2023

Satyawan and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Anil Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. A.G., Haryana

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed *inter-alia* seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to issue joining letters to the petitioners in consonance with the directions given by the Chief Secretary vide letter dated 01.06.2018 as well as order dated 18.05.2018, Annexure P-11, passed by this Court in CWP-18514-2016.
2. Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were applicants for the post of Steno-typist (Hindi) in the EBPG Category pursuant to advertisement dated 10.12.2015, Annexure P-1. Counsel submits that pursuant to the written examination, scrutiny of documents and interview, roll numbers of the petitioners were published in the final result. He submits that petitioners have been selected for the post and have been allocated to a

Government Department. He submits that due to litigation pending before this Court as well as before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, the respondents authorities are not issuing appointment letters to the petitioners. Counsel asserts that similarly placed candidates have been issued appointment letters with a stipulation that the appointment would be subject to the decision of writ petition and SLP pending before the Hon’ble Supreme Court. Counsel submits that the petitioners have submitted representation dated 05.12.2022, Annexure P-15, to respondent No.2 and they would be satisfied in case a direction is issued to the said respondent to examine the same.

- 3. Vide order dated 21.02.2023, this Court issued notice of motion to the respondents, however, despite repeated opportunities, no return has been filed.
- 4. Given the nature of order being passed, this Court does not deem it appropriate to wait for the response from the respondents.
- 5. Having heard counsel for the parties, but without commenting upon the claim raised by the petitioners in the writ petition or in the representation, writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to examine the representation, Annexure P-15, within a period of three months from the date of communication of a copy of this order.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

18.04.2023
Kamal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No