



CWP-12627-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-12627-2024

Date of decision : 27.05.2024

Prem Dutt

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Aditya Yadav, 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 issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the petitioner for promotion on the post of Sub Inspector as the minor punishment of stoppage of three increments with temporary effect is already over and also in view of the Punjab Police Rules, 1934.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a representation dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-3) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1-State in a time bound manner and if after considering the



CWP-12627-2024

2

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-State would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of three months 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-State to consider the representation dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months 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 three months 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-State would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

May 27, 2024
Davinder Kumar