

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

248

CWP-16447-2022 (O&M)
Decided on :14.02.2024

Umesh

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned individual result (Annexure P-12) of the petitioner where the petitioner has been shown to be not eligible with respect to the Advt. No. 6/2019.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that now the petitioner has been selected in the general category of the advertisement in question and thus, the primary prayer made in the petition has been rendered infructuous. It is further submitted that, however, the petitioner be permitted to give a representation to the competent authority of respondent No. 1-State for claiming notional benefits and has submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage, in case, competent

authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to decide the said representation as expeditiously as possible preferably 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, who is appearing on behalf of the respondents, has submitted that in case, any such representation is moved, then the same would be considered in accordance with law by the competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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 as having been rendered infructuous and liberty is granted to the petitioner to move a representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State for claiming notional benefits and in case any such representation is moved, then the competent authority would consider the said representation in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the said 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 said representation.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the said plea of grant of notional benefits and the same will be considered independently by the competent authority of respondent No.1-State in accordance with law.
6. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall stand disposed of with the abovesaid order.

14.02.2024

Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Whether reportable?

Yes/~~No~~

~~Yes~~/No