

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(124)

CWP-21477-2023

Date of decision: - 03.10.2023

Koyal Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Joshi, DAG, Haryana
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus for directing the respondents to re-fix the pay of the husband of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievance of the petitioner, the petitioner has given a detailed representation dated 17.05.2023 (Annexure P-7) to the Commissioner of Police, Gurugram/respondent No.3 and she would be satisfied in case the competent authority of the respondents considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant her the appropriate relief. It is further submitted that in case after consideration, the

competent authority of the respondents finds that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless and reject the same, then, she would not further challenge the said decision.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of the respondents would consider the representation dated 17.05.2023 (Annexure P-7), in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of eight weeks 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 the respondents to consider the representation dated 17.05.2023 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of the respondents 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. In case, the competent authority of the respondents 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 eight weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of the respondents would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

6. As undertaken by learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner would not challenge the said decision in case the competent authority of the respondents, after, considering the pleas raised in the

representation dated 17.05.2023 (Annexure P-7), does not find merit in the same and rejects it.

October 03, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No