

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(265)

CWP-5026-2022

Date of decision: - 13.12.2023

Virender Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Ganesh Sharma, 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 consider the candidature of the petitioner in BCB-Disable Ex-servicemen Category for the appointment to the post of Male Sub-Inspector (Category No.1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 26.10.2021 (Annexure P-9) and the petitioner would be satisfied in case the competent authority of respondent No.2-State 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 State counsel has submitted that the competent

authority of respondent No.2-State would consider the said representation dated 26.10.2021 (Annexure P-9), 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 the competent authority of respondent No.2-State to consider the representation dated 26.10.2021 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of respondent No.2-State 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 the competent authority of respondent No.2-State 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 the competent authority of respondent No.2-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

December 13, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No