

108

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

CWP-761-2024
Date of decision: 12.01.2024

Parveen Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Abhishek Singh, 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 respondents to re-enroll the petitioner as a Home Guard Volunteer as the petitioner has already been acquitted in FIR No.159 dated 08.02.2019 registered under Section 384 of IPC and Sections 7, 13(1) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat.

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 legal notice dated 14.12.2023 (Annexure P-4) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.3 is directed to consider the

said legal notice dated 14.12.2023 (Annexure P-4) 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 respondent No.3 would consider the said legal notice dated 14.12.2023 (Annexure P-4) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of three months 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 respondent No.3 to consider legal notice dated 14.12.2023 (Annexure P-4) in accordance with law within a period of three months 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 respondent No.3 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.3 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 three months 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 respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

12.01.2024

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether reportable:-**

**Yes/No
Yes/No**