

111

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

CWP-6091-2024
Date of decision: 15.03.2024

Vikram and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

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 respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners for granting the benefits of seniority, including pay re-fixation, arrears of salary with interest and all consequential benefits.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition, the petitioners had given legal notice dated 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-9) and they 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 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-9) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas

raised by the petitioners are 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 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-9), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of eight 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 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-9), in accordance with law, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are 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 pleas raised by the petitioners are not meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of eight 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 petitioners independently, in accordance with law.

15.03.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No