



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-10822-2024
Date of decision : 10.05.2024

Anita Gulia

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Sukhbir Singh Goyat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to sanction and release the leave encashment amount with interest at the rate of 24% per annum.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given an application dated 28.01.2024 (Annexure P-5) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the application is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.



3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider the said application and decide the same within a period of 8 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present 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 to consider the application dated 28.01.2024 (Annexure P-2) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 8 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the pleas of the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the pleas of the petitioner are not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 8 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.
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 would consider and decide the application independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

May 10, 2024
Davinder Kumar

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