

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

(123)

**2024:PHHC:030397  
CWP-5014-2024  
Date of Decision: 04.03.2024**

Baggu Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

--Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL.**

Present:- Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, 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 for directing the respondents to grant the benefit of judgement dated 28.10.2013 passed by this Court in CWP-12828-1993 titled as “Krishan Lal Vs. State of Punjab and others” after considering the whole service of the petitioner on the post of Draftsman.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the said purpose petitioner has got served legal notice dated 27.03.2021 (Annexure P-5) and submits that the competent authority of respondent no.1-State may be directed to consider the said legal notice in a time bound manner and in case, the claim of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then, grant them the necessary relief.
3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that the legal notice dated 27.03.2021 (Annexure P-5) served by the petitioner would be considered by competent authority of respondent no.1, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four months from today.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to the competent authority of respondent no.1 to consider the legal notice dated 27.03.2021 (Annexure P-5) served by petitioner, in accordance with law, within a period of four months from today 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 of respondent no.1 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 four 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.1 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE

04.03.2024

lucky

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable:        | Yes/No |