

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

(109)

CWP-8712-2024

Date of decision: - 20.04.2024

Amrit Pal Singh Julka

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Davinder Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. TPS 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 commanding the respondents to partially modify the office order dated 19.10.2023 (Annexure P-5) and other prayers have also been made.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-8) and at this stage, the petitioner 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 pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.
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 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-8), filed by

the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two 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 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-8) filed by the petitioner within a period of two 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 pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible. In case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two 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 20, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No