

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

120

CWP-31-2023

Date of Decision: 21.08.2023

Nitin Bhardwaj

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Senior Panel Counsel
for Union of India-respondent

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, apart from other prayers is seeking direction to respondents to consider and decide legal notice dated 12.01.2022 (Annexure P-3).

2. Mr. Rajeev Anand, learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that petitioner applied for the post of constable in C.R.P.F pursuant to an advertisement. He applied under Other Backward Class Category. He qualified all the tests including written examination but on account of minor infirmity in documents, he was not made to join. He filed CWP No.22838 of 2011 challenging rejection of his candidature. The said petition was disposed of vide order dated 09.12.2011 with a direction to the petitioner to approach authorities. The petitioner was issued appointment letter in March' 2012, however, after two months, he

was declared unfit in medical examination. He filed CWP No.2123 of 2013 before this Court which was allowed vide order dated 18.11.2013 and respondents were directed to permit the petitioner to join. The petitioner joined in 2013, however he has been allotted New Force Number of 2014. Accordingly, his salary has been determined. He would get all the career progression benefits as per 2014 batch whereas he belongs to 2012 batch. The petitioner has sent legal notice dated 12.01.2022 (Annexure P-3) which has not been redressed by the respondents.

3. Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Advocate, who on advance notice is present in Court on behalf of the respondents, asserts that competent authority would look into the grievance of the petitioner and pass an appropriate order within 6 weeks from today.

4. Face with this statement, learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the aforesaid arrangement.

5. In the wake of statements of both sides, the present petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

21.08.2023
Mohit Kumar

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>