

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(106)

CWP-17604-2020

Date of decision: - 18.01.2024

Baljeet

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Nikhil Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Raj Kumar Bhatia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned recommendation list dated 20.08.2020 (Annexure P-4).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a detailed representation dated 26.09.2020 (Annexure P-9) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case competent authority of respondent No.2 considers the same in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted

that competent authority of respondent No.2 would consider the said representation dated 26.09.2020 (Annexure P-9), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three months from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to competent authority of respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 26.09.2020 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case competent authority of respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case, competent authority of respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

January 18, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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