

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

(248)

CWP-9580-2020

Date of decision: - 15.01.2024

Ram Kishore

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Sandeep Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus to consider the claim of the petitioner for promotion as Inspector from the date when his junior was promoted as Inspector i.e. 29.01.2009 and the petitioner be granted all consequential benefits.

2. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the reply filed on behalf respondents No.1 and 2, it has been stated that the pay of the petitioner was fixed actually instead of notionally vide order dated 22.11.2022. The relevant portion of the reply, which has been highlighted, is reproduced herein below: -

*“Accordingly the matter was again re-examined by the office of
Director General of Police Haryana on the representation of the
petitioner and after taking opinion from Ld. Advocate General of*

Haryana, the pay of the petitioner was fixed actually instead of notionally vide order dated 22.11.2022 and accordingly the pension of the petitioner has also been re-fixed and the case for revised pension was sent to Accountant General, Haryana vide letter dated 23.12.2022. The copy of order dated 22.11.2022 is attached here with as Annexure R-3 and the copy of letter dated 23.12.2022 is attached herewith as Annexure R-4.”

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has stated that the said reply substantially satisfies the clam of the petitioner, but has made a limited prayer that since his office has not been able to get in touch with the petitioner, therefore, in case the revised pension of the petitioner has not been fixed, then, the same be fixed in a time bound manner.

4. Learned State counsel has submitted that in case revised pension of the petitioner has not been fixed, then, the same would be done as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous. In case the revised pension of the petitioner has not been fixed, the same be fixed as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

January 15, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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