

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

(127)

**2024:PHHC:053938
CWP-8858-2024
Date of Decision: 22.04.2024**

Rohit Singla

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL.

Present:- Ms. R.K. Grewal, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Walia, AAAG, 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 respondents to issue the appointment letter to the petitioner for the post of Junior Engineer (Civil) against Advertisement No.2 dated 5.3.2021 (Annexures P-1 & P-2).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 20.3.2024 (Annexure P-23) and at this stage petitioner would be satisfied, in case, the competent authority is directed to consider the said legal notice 20.3.2024 (Annexure P-23) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.
3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that competent authority of respondent No.1 would consider the said legal notice 20.3.2024 (Annexure P-23) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1 to consider the legal notice 20.3.2024 (Annexure P-23), in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority of respondent No.1 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months 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 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

22.04.2024

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No