

125

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-1863-2024
Date of decision: 29.01.2024

Krishan ...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. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the transfer order dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-6) passed by the Inspector General of Police, Karnal Range, Karnal.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the case of the petitioner is covered by the instructions (Annexure P-5) and has submitted that regarding the same, the petitioner would give a representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State within three days from today and has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State may consider the said representation in a time bound manner. It is further prayed that till the time the said representation is not considered, status quo as it exists today may kindly be ordered.
3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that in case the representation is made within three days from today, the same would be considered by the competent authority of respondent No.1-State within 10 days 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 the following observations/directions:-

- a) It would be open to the petitioner to give representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State within a period of three days from today.
- b) In case any such representation is given within the said period of three days then the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the same within 10 days thereafter.
- c) Till the time the competent authority of respondent No.1-State considers the said representation, status quo as it exists today would be maintained.
- d) In case, the pleas raised by the petitioner in the said representation are found to be meritorious by the competent authority of respondent No.1-State then the competent authority 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 10 days from the date of receipt of the 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.

29.01.2024

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No