

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-9489-2023

Date of decision : 16.08.2023

Rajat Pannu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Nagar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana
for the respondents.

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 in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the post of Sub Inspector (Male) in pursuance to Advt. no.3/2018 category no.4 Sub Inspector (Male) as the petitioner was placed in waiting list result dated 02.04.2019 (Annexure P-4).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-6) to the respondents including respondent no.3 and would be satisfied that in case the competent authority of respondent no.3 is directed to consider the same in accordance with law in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea of the

petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.3 would look into the legal notice dated 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-6) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order, in accordance with law.

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.3 to consider the legal notice 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-6) of the petitioner, 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 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 three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent no.3 would consider and decide the legal notice independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

August 16, 2023
Davinder Kumar

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