

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-3993-2023(O&M)

Date of decision : 05.07.2023

Jaibir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Yogesh Vashista, Advocate for
Dr.Pankaj Nanhera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl.A.G. Haryana
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

CM-8899-CWP-2023

1. This is an application under Section 151 CPC for preponing the writ petition which is stated to be listed for 11.09.2023.

2. For the reasons stated in the application, the application is allowed and the main case is preponed from 11.09.2023 to today itself for hearing.

CWP-3993-2023

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police w.e.f. March 2019. Other prayers have also been made in the writ petition.

grievances raised in the present petition, the petitioner has given detailed representation dated 07.09.2020 (Annexure P-16) to respondent no.2 and has submitted that he would be satisfied that in case respondent no.2 is directed to consider the same, in accordance with law and pass a speaking order in the same.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent no.2 would consider the representation dated 07.09.2020 (Annexure P-16), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two 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 petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2 to consider the representation dated 07.09.2020 (Annexure P-16) as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case the plea raised by the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order would be passed by respondent no.2 within the aforesaid period.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent no.2 would consider the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

July 05, 2023
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No