

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-1615-2024
Date of decision : 25.01.2024

Monika

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Devender Arya, 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 consider the date of appointment of the petitioner from the date her juniors/counterparts have been given appointment and also for giving all the consequential benefits arising therefrom.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent no.1 and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said 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 petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

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 the said representation.

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 which would be filed by the petitioner 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 the said representation and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea of the petitioner 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 the representation.

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.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

January 25, 2024.
Davinder Kumar

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