

234

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-24288-2023
Date of decision: 07.03.2024

Baljit Singh Singroha

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Himanshu Gupta, 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 release the gratuity which was due to the petitioner w.e.f. 30.04.2018 along with interest.
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 dated 17.07.2023 (Annexure P-9) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is directed to consider the said representation dated 17.07.2023 (Annexure P-9) 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.1-State would consider the said representation dated 17.07.2023 (Annexure P-9), in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of eight weeks 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.1-State to consider representation dated 17.07.2023 (Annexure P-9), in accordance with law, within a period of eight weeks 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 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority 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 eight weeks 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.1-State would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

07.03.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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