

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

251

CWP-20694-2022
Decided on :14.03.2024

Arun Kumar

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Ajit Kumar Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. R. D. Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to give 5 marks to the petitioner for Socio-Economic Criteria and select the petitioner on post of Male Constable.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given representation 01.07.2022 (Annexure P-8) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No. 2-Haryana Staff Selection Commission is directed to consider the said representation dated 01.07.2022 (Annexure P-8) 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 has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No. 2 would consider the said representation dated 01.07.2022 (Annexure P-8) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority of respondent No. 2 to consider representation dated 01.07.2022 (Annexure P-8) in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority of respondent No. 2 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority of respondent No. 2 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 two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No. 2 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

14.03.2024
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/~~No~~
~~Yes~~/No