

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

(112)

CWP-8732-2024**Date of decision: - 20.04.2024****Rajender Singh and others****....Petitioners****Versus****State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Umesh Narang, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant the benefit of one increment on completion of 12 months of service on the day of retirement i.e. on 1st July in the light of settled preposition of law.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioners, the petitioners had given a legal notice dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-5) and at this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied, in case, the 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 petitioners is found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents-State has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would

consider the said legal notice dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-5), filed by the petitioners, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the legal notice dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioners within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioners is meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioners, as expeditiously as possible. In case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioners is meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three months.

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 and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 20, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No