

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-973-2024(O&M)
Date of decision : 29.01.2024

Rakesh Kumar and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Ripudaman S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Ferry Sofat, Addl.A.G.Punjab.

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 certiorari quashing the advertisement dated 29.06.2023 (Annexure P-3).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, the petitioners have given a representation dated 16.01.2024 (Annexure P-12) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1 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 respondent no.1 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of two months from the date of the receipt

of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent no.1 to consider the representation dated 16.01.2024 (Annexure P-12) of the petitioners and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order 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 two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

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

6. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

January 29, 2024.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No