

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

(110)

CWP-25320-2023

Date of decision: - 09.11.2023

Sukhram Singh and others**....petitioners****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Akhil Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

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 especially a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant the benefits of 4-9-14 years ACP Scheme alongwith all consequential benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioners, the petitioners have given a representation dated 07.07.2023 (Annexure P-4) and the petitioners would be satisfied in case the competent authority of respondent No.1-State considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent

authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said representation dated 07.07.2023 (Annexure P-4), filed by the petitioners, 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.1-State to consider the representation dated 07.07.2023 (Annexure P-4) filed by the petitioners 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.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to the petitioners as expeditiously as possible. In case the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners 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.1-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

November 09, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No