

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(104)

CWP-7054-2024

Date of decision: - 22.03.2024

Mohd. Mustufa

....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Ankur Sidhar, 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 of the Constitution of India for issuance of appropriate writ, order or direction especially for a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent Commission to correct the category of the petitioner to BC-B (got applied in General automatically) and to consider his candidature accordingly.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 18.03.2024 (Annexure P-9) 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 plea raised by the petitioner is 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 representation dated 18.03.2024 (Annexure P-9), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two 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 representation dated 18.03.2024 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioner within a period of two 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 plea raised by the petitioner is 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 plea raised by the petitioner is meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two 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 22, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No