

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-3469-2024
Date of decision : 16.02.2024

Thuru Ram

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Arvind Kashyap, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ferry Sofat, Addl.A.G.Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-8) to the extent of not granting 4 year ACP scale and grade pay of Rs.4200/- w.e.f. 01.01.2006.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the impugned order dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-8), the petitioner has been granted 9 year increment as well as 14 year increment but however, no reason has been given as to why he has not been given 4 year increment and grade pay of Rs.4200/- w.e.f. 01.01.2006 and has further submitted that for the said grievance, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent no.2 within a period of two weeks from today and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said

representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.2 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.2 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the 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.2 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 three months from the date of the receipt of the 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 three 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.2 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

February 16, 2024
Davinder Kumar

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