

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CWP-3060-2023
Date of Decision: 12.02.2024

Amarjot Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr.Ritesh Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anurag Chopra, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to decide his representation dated 18.05.2017 (Annexure P-1).
2. The father of the petitioner joined BSF and at a later stage, he joined Punjab Police. During militancy in State of Punjab, terrorists killed his brother-in-law. The petitioner made a representation to respondents seeking appointment on compassionate ground. The petitioner claimed appointment on the basis of murder of his maternal uncle. The respondent processed his representation, however, did not give him appointment letter.
3. Learned State counsel, at the outset, submits that representation of the petitioner has already been adjudicated by DGP. The order was passed in the month of May' 2023 and the petitioner has not assailed said order.

4. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has never been served with copy of aforesaid order.
5. Learned State counsel asserts that a copy of the order, during the course of the day, would be supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.
6. In the wake of afore-stated factual position and submissions of both sides, the present petition stands disposed of.

12.02.2024

anju

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

No