

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CWP-8309-2024
Decided on: 16.04.2024

Jyoti Sharma

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. K. P. S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. T. P. S. Chawla, Sr. DAG, 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 consider the case of the petitioner for regularizing the services as the petitioner has been working continuously since 31.07.2013 till date.
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 representation dated 23.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No. 1 is directed to consider the said representation dated 23.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) 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 representation dated 23.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably

within a period of six 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 competent authority of respondent No. 1 to consider representation dated 23.02.2024 (Annexure P-4) in accordance with law within a period of six weeks 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 six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. It is made clear that 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 petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

16.04.2024
Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/ No
Whether reportable?	Yes /No