

108

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

CWP-26453-2023

Date of decision: 24.11.2023

Karambir

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Nafeesh Ahmed, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner with respect to extension of duty of Home Guards volunteers.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given representation dated 01.10.2023 (Annexure P-10) to respondent No.2 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider the said representation dated 01.10.2023 (Annexure P-10) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant

necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said representation dated 01.10.2023 (Annexure P-10) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider representation dated 01.10.2023 (Annexure P-10) in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

24.11.2023

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No