

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-27173-2023

Date of decision : 04.12.2023

Meenakshi Sharma and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Neeraj Goel, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Amandeep Joshi, DAG, 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 for directing the respondents to regularize the job of the petitioners who are serving as Scientific Assistants under the respondent department.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, the petitioners would give a representation to the respondent authorities and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by the competent authority of the respondent-State in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of the respondent-State would consider the said representation and

decide the same within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of

the said representation.

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 respondent-State to consider the representation of the petitioners and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of the said representation and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners and in case, the plea of the petitioners is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of the representation.

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

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

December 04, 2023.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No