

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(112)

CWP-8313-2024

Date of decision: - 16.04.2024

Ranvit

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Mandeep Singh Lamba, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Joshi, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to change the gender and the name of the petitioner in service record in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of “**National Legal Services Authority Vs. Union of India and others, 2014(5) SCC 438.**”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 18.03.2024 (Annexure P-18) 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-18), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of four 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-18) filed by the petitioner within a period of four 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 four 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.

April 16, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No