

122

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

CWP-14678-2023

Date of decision: 13.07.2023

Manisha

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana
for respondent Nos.1 to 6.

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 respondent Nos.1 to 4 to appoint the petitioner on the post of Deputy Superintendent of Police in Haryana Police in view of the policies issued by the State of Haryana, prior to 2018 i.e., 06.01.2009 (Annexure P-7), 20.08.2013 (Annexure P-8) and 15.07.2014 (Annexure P-9) as well as on the basis of parity granted to the other sports persons.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised in the present writ petition, the present petitioner has given a legal notice dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-10) to all the respondents including respondent No.2 and has prayed that the said legal

notice be considered by respondent No.2 in a time bound manner and in case, pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the necessary relief be also granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the pleas raised by the petitioner are highly belated as the petitioner is seeking parity with the persons who were appointed as DSP in the year 2013.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to consider the legal notice dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-10) 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 to grant necessary relief to the petitioner in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not found to be meritorious then respondent No.2 would pass a speaking order rejecting the claim of the petitioner in the said period of three months.

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

13.07.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:-****Yes/No****Whether reportable:-****Yes/No**