

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

(111)

CWP-10046-2024**Date of decision: - 03.05.2024****Jaswant Singh****....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Jaspal Singh Maanipur, Advocate, and
Mr. Joy Preet Meelu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. TPS Walia, AAG, Punjab.

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 or direction especially in the nature of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 23.01.2001 under the Policy of regularization dated 23.01.2001 (Annexure P-3) and grant him pensionary benefits along with interest @ 9% per annum w.e.f. 01.06.2023.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 13.02.2024 (Annexure P-7) 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 13.02.2024 (Annexure P-7), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of six weeks 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 said legal notice dated 13.02.2024 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner within a period of six weeks 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, 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 six weeks.

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.

May 03, 2024

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No