

113

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

CWP-2876-2024
Date of decision: 09.02.2024

Rinku Dhankhar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 give all the benefits regarding service rendered by the petitioners in Police Department as Female Constable (HAP Durga-1).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition, petitioner Nos.1 to 4 have given legal notice dated 08.01.2024 (Annexure P-5) and petitioner No.5 has given a separate legal notice dated 22.01.2024 (Annexure P-5) and they would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider both the abovesaid legal notices in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief in accordance with

law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider both the abovesaid legal notices in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider both the abovesaid legal notices in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious 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 petitioners are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of four weeks 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the case of the petitioners independently, in accordance with law.

09.02.2024

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No