

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

**Sr. No.266****CWP-6717-2023****Date of decision: 22.11.2023****GAURAV YADAV****.....Petitioner****versus****STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER****.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present: Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition 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 petitioner for the post of “Sub-Inspector” as he fulfills the eligibility criteria.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a detailed representation (Annexure P-12) to respondent No.2 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.2 is directed to consider the said representation (Annexure P-12) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.2 would consider the said representation (Annexure P-12) 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 abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.2 to consider the representation (Annexure P-12) 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 petitioner 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 of respondent No.2 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE

22.11.2023  
Pawan/sim

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |