

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

(120)

CWP-6387-2024

Date of decision: - 18.03.2024

Gobind and another

....petitioners

Versus**State of Haryana and others**

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

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

Ms. Palika Monga, 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 for directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners, which has been raised in the legal notice dated 30.01.2024 (Annexure P-9).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, the petitioners had given a legal notice dated 30.01.2024 (Annexure P-9) and at this stage, the petitioners 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 petitioners are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted

that competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 30.01.2024 (Annexure P-9), filed by the petitioners, 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 30.01.2024 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioners 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 petitioners are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioners, as expeditiously as possible. In case, competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners 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 18, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No