

114

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

CWP-16479-2023

Date of decision: 01.08.2023

Naresh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Jaspal Singh Maanipur, Advocate and
Ms. Harpreet Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

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, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to supply the order of termination from service.

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 legal notice dated 11.05.2023 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the said respondent No.2 is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 11.05.2023 (Annexure P-3) in a time bound manner, in accordance with law and in

case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to take necessary action, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said legal notice dated 11.05.2023 (Annexure P-3) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks 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 direction to respondent No.2 to consider the legal notice dated 11.05.2023 (Annexure P-3), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks 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 respondent No.2 would take necessary follow-up action, in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and in case, respondent No.2 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 four weeks 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 respondent No.2 would consider the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

01.08.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:-****Yes/No****Whether reportable:-****Yes/No**