



CWP-11406-2024

121

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

CWP-11406-2024

Date of decision: 16.05.2024

Satpal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 respondents to pay the subsistence allowance as per the provisions of Rule 7.2 of Punjab Civil Services Rules Volume I.

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 dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-13) to respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider the said representation dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-13) 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.1-State would consider the said representation dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-13) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.
4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the representation dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-13) in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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 six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.
5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

16.05.2024
Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether reportable:-	Yes/No