

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

(130)

CWP-5131-2024

Date of decision: - 04.03.2024

Sukhbir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Meghna, Advocate
for Mr. Sunil Kumar Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, 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 respondents to promote the petitioner from Constable to Head Constable and grant the benefit of 1st ACP as per completion of 10 years service in the year of 2021. Other prayers have also been made in the present writ petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-2) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case competent authority of respondent No.1-State considers the same, 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 competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-2), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three 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 competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the legal notice dated 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-2) filed by the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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-State 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 three 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-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

March 04, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No