

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(108)

CWP-25298-2023

Date of decision: - 09.11.2023

Raghvir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Amrik Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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 in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to promote the petitioner according to his seniority from the date when his juniors have been promoted as Road Inspector with all consequential benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 11.09.2023 (Annexure P-10) and the petitioner would be satisfied in case respondent No.2 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 the appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said legal notice dated 11.09.2023 (Annexure P-10),

filed by the petitioner, 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 respondent No.2 to consider the legal notice dated 11.09.2023 (Annexure P-10) filed by the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case 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. In case 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 respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

November 09, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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