

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(268)

CWP-21012-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: - 11.09.2023

Parvesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner with respect to his selection for the post of Constable.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioner, a detailed representation dated 26.07.2022 (Annexure P-11) has been given to the Chairman, Haryana Staff Selection Commission Panchkula and has submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied, at this stage, in case the competent authority of respondent No.2 considers the said representation in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, to grant him appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.2 would take a final decision on the representation dated 26.07.2022 (Annexure P-11), in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three months from the date of certified copy of this order.

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.2 to take a final decision on the representation dated 26.07.2022 (Annexure P-11) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible and in case, the competent authority of respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three months.

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

September 11, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No