

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-9038-2024
Date of decision : 23.04.2024

Mohinder Pal Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Rajinder Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.T.P.S. Walia, AAG, 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 respondent no.2 to decide the legal notice dated 02.12.2023 (Annexure P-5).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioners, the petitioners had given a legal notice dated 02.12.2023 (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 02.12.2023 (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 02.12.2023 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioners, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, 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 and after hearing all the concerned parties.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

April 23, 2024.
Davinder Kumar

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