

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

(226)

CWP-28817-2018

Date of decision: - 25.04.2024

Janak Raj

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. JPS Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner. (Through VC)

Ms. Neha Sonawane, DAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to treat the service of petitioner from 03.02.1984 as regular service for all service benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner had given a legal notice dated 30.05.2018 (Annexure P-3) and at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State considers the same, in accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents-State has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would

consider the said legal notice dated 30.05.2018 (Annexure P-3), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of two 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 the competent authority of respondent No.1-State to consider the legal notice dated 30.05.2018 (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order and in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioner is meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible. In case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the plea raised by the petitioner is meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two months.

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 matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 25, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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