

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

(115)

CWP-28993-2023

Date of decision: - 21.12.2023

Sajjan Kumar**....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Deepak Vashishth, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

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 in the nature of mandamus for directing the respondents/authorities to grant the pay or fixation or stepping up of pay of the petitioner at par with his junior i.e. respondent No.6 who belongs to the reserve category from the date of promotion when the said respondent was promoted as ASI and Inspector in view of letter No.12317-29/E-III(2) dated 06.10.2020 (Annexure P-8) and letter dated 24.08.2020 (Annexure P-7).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 21.04.2023 (Annexure P-9) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case competent authority of respondent No.1 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 to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents-State has submitted that competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider the said legal notice dated 21.04.2023 (Annexure P-9), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of four weeks 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 competent authority of respondent No.1 to consider the legal notice dated 21.04.2023 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case, competent authority of respondent No.1 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 four weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

December 21, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No