

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-8661-2024(O&M)
Date of decision : 20.04.2024

Sachin

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Ashish Pannu, Advocate
for the petitioner (through V.C.).

Ms.Rajni Gupta, Addl.A.G. Haryana.

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 certiorari to quash the final result dated 14.03.2024 (Annexure P-11) whereby the candidature of the petitioner for appointment to the post of the Scientific Staff Group-C Forensic Science Laboratory of various categories in Police Department has been rejected.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation (Annexure P-12) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.2 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3.

Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.2 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of 8 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.
4.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent no.2 to consider the representation (Annexure P-12) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 8 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the pleas of the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the pleas of the petitioner are not found to be meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 8 weeks from the date of the 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.2 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)

JUDGE

April 20, 2024

Davinder Kumar

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