

135

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

CWP-29389-2023

Date of decision: 22.12.2023

Jeet Ram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Dr. Suresh Kumar Redhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the impugned tentative seniority list (Annexure P-18) to the extent that juniors have been granted seniority in reservation category.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that although the petitioner had given several representations detailing his grievance but is not in possession of the copy of the said representations and has submitted that the petitioner would submit fresh detailed representation mentioning the grievance to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State and has prayed that he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State considers and takes a decision on the same in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then 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 representation as and when filed by the petitioner, mentioning all the aspects as mentioned in the present writ petition in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of said representation.

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 the representation as and when filed by the petitioner mentioning all the aspects as mentioned in the present writ petition, in accordance with law within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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 eight weeks from the date of receipt of said representation.

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.

22.12.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No****Whether reportable:- Yes/No**