

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

(261)

CWP-5304-2022

Date of decision: - 18.01.2024

Priyanka

....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Jayoti Prashad Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent No.1 to award three marks of Post Graduate certificate and select the petitioner in Haryana Police.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that at this stage the petitioner would be satisfied in case the present writ petition is treated as a representation and the said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent No.1/Haryana Staff Selection Commission, in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1 would treat the present

writ petition as representation and would decide the same in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two months from the date of certified copy of this order.

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 treat the present writ petition as a representation and decide the same within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case, competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

January 18, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No