

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

(257)

**2023:PHHC:098336
CWP-4040-2023
Date of Decision: 01.08.2023**

Anil Kumar & another

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL.

Present:- Mr. Nafeesh Ahmed, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Amandeep Joshi, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL.J (Oral)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to re-instate/re-enroll the petitioners on the post of Home-guard from where services of the petitioners have been dispensed with.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition, the petitioners had given a legal notice dated 24.12.2022 (Annexure P-8) to respondent No.2 and the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 24.12.2022 (Annexure P-8) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that competent authority would consider the said legal notice dated 24.12.2022 (Annexure P-8) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period

of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority to consider the legal notice dated 24.12.2022 (Annexure P-8), in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioners are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority would consider the case of the petitioners independently and in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

01.08.2023

lucky

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