

112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-9032-2024
Date of decision: 23.04.2024

Vikas ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Rajat Mor, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to grant five marks under socio-economic criteria for no job to the petitioner as per the selection criteria for selection and appointment on the post of Male Constable (GD) in the Haryana Police in view of terms and conditions of Advertisement No.3/2018 dated 16.04.2018 and as well as selection criteria and in case five marks are awarded to the petitioner for the socio-economic criteria for no Government job, then he comes in the selection zone for the post of Male Constable (GD).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a representation but has submitted that he would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent No.3 and he would

be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said representation in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.3 would consider the abovesaid representation, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority of respondent No.3 to consider the abovesaid representation, in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, the competent authority would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious, then, a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

23.04.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No