

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

254

CWP-1404-2024

Date of Decision :29.01.2024

Vishal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rajesh Khandelwal, Advocate for
Mr. Ankur Sidhar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, challenge is to order dated 08.01.2019 (Annexure P-10) by which, the claim of the petitioner for the grant of appointment to the post of Junior Coach has been declined by the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a bare perusal of the impugned order would show that not even a single reason has been given by the respondents for the non-grant of benefit, which was being sought by the petitioner hence, the impugned order 08.01.2019 (Annexure P-10) being cryptic and non-speaking cannot be sustained in the eyes of law keeping in view the settled principle of law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Civil Appeal No.457-1970 titled as Mahabir Prasad Santosh Kumar vs. State of U.P. and others decided on 02.04.1970.**

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that keeping in

view the fact that detail reasons could not be mentioned in the impugned order dated 08.01.2019 (Annexure P-10), the same may be treated as withdrawn and liberty be given to the respondents to pass a fresh speaking order on the claim of the petitioner within a period of 08 weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order, which speaking order will be conveyed to the petitioner also.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents, present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

5. Ordered accordingly.

January 29, 2024
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No