

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

(117)

CWP-16998-2023**Date of decision: - 29.02.2024****Bunty****....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Amrik Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to mark his presence as Sweeper and further consider his case under the purview of The Punjab Ad-hoc, Contractual, Daily Wage, Temporary, Work Charged and Outsourced Employees Welfare Act, 2016 (Punjab Act of 55 of 2016) till his case is being considered for regularization under The Punjab Ad-hoc, Contractual, Daily Wage, Temporary, Work Charged and Outsourced Employees Welfare Act, 2016.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 06.09.2022 (Annexure P-9) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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.1-State would consider the said legal notice dated 06.09.2022 (Annexure P-9), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of six weeks 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.1-State to consider the legal notice dated 06.09.2022 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioner within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case competent authority of respondent No.1-State 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.1-State 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 six weeks.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

February 29, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No