

115
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-6170-2024
Date of decision: 15.03.2024

Charanjeet Singh
...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Raj Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. TPS Walia, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the competent authority of respondent No.1 to issue and release the grant/sanction letter in response to the order passed in the proceedings dated 09.12.2021 (Annexure P-1)
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 legal notice dated 05.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 05.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) in a time bound manner and in case, the plea raised by the

petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 05.02.2024 (Annexure P-4), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider legal notice dated 05.02.2024 (Annexure P-4), in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, the competent authority would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority is of the opinion that the plea raised by the petitioner is not meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of four weeks 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

15.03.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether reportable:-	Yes/No