

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-9314-2023(O&M)

Date of decision : 20.11.2023

Pankaj Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Kuldeep Khandelwal, Advocate for
Mr.Ankur Sidhar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Amandeep Joshi, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the socio economic criteria of the petitioner as on cut off date i.e. 10.02.2021 and to grant him consequential benefits accordingly, inter alia, 5 marks for “No Govt. Job in Family” in the interest of justice.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to respondent no.3 and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by respondent no.3 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent no.3 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of 2 months from the date of the receipt of the representation.
4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.3 to consider the representation of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 2 months from the date of the receipt of the representation and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea of the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 2 months from the date of the receipt of the representation.
5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent no.3 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.
6. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

November 20, 2023.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No