

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

(261)

CWP-8416-2022

Date of decision: - 11.01.2024

Poonam Yadav

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Parmod Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, 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, order or direction especially for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the Final Result dated 31.03.2022 (Annexure P-6) for the post of Female Constables for HAP Durga-1.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 04.04.2022 (Annexure P-7) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case competent authority of respondent No.2 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.2 would consider the said representation dated 04.04.2022 (Annexure P-7), 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.2 to consider the representation dated 04.04.2022 (Annexure P-7) 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.2 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.2 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 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.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

January 11, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No