

210
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-14741-2017(O&M)
Date of decision: 12.02.2024

Balraj Singla and others

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Anil Rana, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Gaurav Jindal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari and Quo-Warranto quashing the order dated 29.06.2017 (Annexure P-10) whereby the juniors of the petitioners have been promoted ignoring the petitioners despite the fact that they have not completed 8 years of experience as required under the Haryana Municipal Services (Integration, Recruitment and Conditions of Service), Rules, 2010 with a further prayer to issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to promote the petitioners to the post of Executive Engineers (Civil).

2. At the outset, Mr. Anil Rana, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has stated that he is also a counsel in the present case. He submitted that the present petition can now be disposed of in view of the fact

that some of the petitioners have already been promoted after passing the examination conducted by the AICTE and now the only claim of the petitioners is that they should be given the promotion with retrospective effect from the date when their juniors were promoted and regarding which the petitioners may be granted liberty to file a comprehensive representation to respondent No.2 so as to take a decision in that respect for retrospective date of promotion in accordance with law and therefore, the present petition may be disposed of accordingly.

3. Mr. Gaurav Jindal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana appearing on behalf of the State of Haryana submitted that the State has no objection in case the prayer of the petitioners for disposing of the petition as aforesaid is accepted in view of the stand taken by the State in the reply.

4. In view of the aforesaid specific prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of. Liberty is granted to the petitioners to make any comprehensive representation to the concerned authority including respondent No.2 with regard to their prayer for seeking retrospective date of promotion and in case any such representation is filed, then the same shall be considered and decided by respondent No.2/competent authority as expeditiously as possible.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

12.02.2024
rakesh

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