



CWP-23012-2024

1

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

(125)

CWP-23012-2024

Date of Decision : September 11, 2024

Gopal Kishan Arora

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. S.K. Rattan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amarpreet Singh Bains, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab.**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)**

1. In the present writ petition, the grievance of the petitioner is that the service rendered by the petitioner in the Department of Fisheries has not been taken into account for fixation of pay after the petitioner joined the Department of Education, which act on the part of the respondents is totally arbitrary and illegal and contrary to the Rule 4.4 of the Punjab Civil Services Rules as interpreted by this Court in ***CWP No.4629 of 2012 titled as Sunil Kumar Sharma and others vs. State of Punjab, decided on 19.02.2018***, which judgment has already been upheld by the Division Bench of this Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the grievance raised in the present petition has already been raised by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 05.08.2024 (Annexure P-6) which is still pending

**CWP-23012-2024****2**

consideration with the respondents and the petitioner will be satisfied at this stage in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said legal notice by passing an appropriate speaking order.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Amarpreet Singh Bains, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case the legal notice dated 05.08.2024 (Annexure P-6) has been received in the office of the concerned authorities and the same is still pending consideration with the authorities concerned, the same will be decided by the competent authority within a period of eight weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of this order by passing an appropriate speaking order and in case, after the decision any relief is to be extended to the petitioner, the same will be extended, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned in the speaking order to be passed for not accepting the claim of the petitioner for his information and necessary action.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement of learned State counsel, the present writ petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

7. Ordered accordingly.

September 11, 2024
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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