

CWP-20637-2023

1

2024:PHHC:019729

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-20637-2023

Date of decision : 13.02.2024

Jagjit Kumar and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms.Neha Sonawane, DAG, Punjab.

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 grant of Annual increment in view of proviso of law prescribed under Rule 4.7 Vol.1 Part 1 of The Punjab Civil Service Rules for the period of 31.01.2013 to 26.01.2016.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, the petitioners have given a representation dated 10.12.2022 (Annexure P-7) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent

authority of respondent no.1 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present 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 to consider the representation dated 10.12.2022 (Annexure P-7) of the petitioners and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners and in case, the plea of the petitioners is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

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 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

February 13, 2024
Davinder Kumar

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