

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

(122)

CWP-15337-2023

Date of decision: - 20.07.2023

Sumit

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Rajat Mor, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to grant 5 marks under socio-economic criteria for selection and appointment to the post of Male Constable (GD) in the Haryana Police in view of terms and conditions of Advt. No.3/2018 dated 16.04.2018 – Category No.1 (Annexure P-1) as well as selection criteria of the Government of Haryana dated 12.11.2018 (Annexure P-15) as, in case 5 marks are awarded to the petitioner, then, he would have more marks than the last candidate.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has given a representation dated 25.02.2021 (Annexure P-13), which has not been decided till date. It is prayed that the petitioner be permitted to give a representation detailing his grievance and he would be satisfied in case the competent authority of respondent No.3 is directed to decide the same in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a

time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that in case the previous representation dated 25.02.2021 (Annexure P-13) has not been decided and no order has been passed on the same, then, the competent authority of respondent No.3 would consider and decide the subsequent representation, if so filed, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.3 to decide the representation, if so filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said representation. In case, the case of the petitioner has already been rejected by the authorities by passing a speaking order, then, the said fact along with a copy of the order be conveyed to the petitioner within a period of three months.

5. In case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, the necessary relief be also granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case the pleas raised by the petitioner are not found to be meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim of the petitioner be passed within the aforesaid period.

July 20, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No