

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

283

CWP-17170-2023

Date of Decision: 13.12.2023

Ranjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajit Singh Natt, AAG, Punjab.

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 representation (Annexure P-7) in the light of the recommendation dated 19.01.2023 (Annexure P-10) of the department itself.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances made by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 20.12.2022 (Annexure P-7) to the respondent-State and at this stage, he would be satisfied in case the representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent No.1-State, in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider the said representation and

decide the same within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State, to consider the representation dated 20.12.2022 (Annexure P-7) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, after considering the same, the plea raised by 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 the same would be liable to be rejected by the respondent-State by passing a speaking order, within a period of two months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of the respondent No.1-State, would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

13.12.2023

D.Bansal

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

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