

114

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-4618-2024
Date of decision: 28.02.2024

Mamta

...Petitioner

Versus

District and Sessions Judge, Faridabad and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. B.S. Tewatia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

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 mandamus directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for family pension after the death of her father.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given representation dated 03.10.2022 (Annexure P-5) and she would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.1 is directed to consider the said representation dated 03.10.2022 (Annexure P-5) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then to grant necessary relief immediately, in accordance with

law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.1 would consider the said representation dated 03.10.2022 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months 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 respondent No.1 to consider representation dated 03.10.2022 (Annexure P-5), in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then respondent No.1 would grant necessary relief immediately, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.1 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 two months 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 respondent No.1 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

28.02.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No