

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

(231)

CWP-34962-2019 (O&M)**Date of decision: - 15.02.2024****Ravinder Singh****....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Rajender Singh Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Joshi, 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 writ, order or direction especially in the nature of certiorari for quashing the notice-cum-order dated 18.09.2019 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.4.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that subsequent to the passing of the order, a subsequent event has taken place which would entitle the petitioner notional benefits and the petitioner prays that he be permitted to give a representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State giving all the details of the said subsequent event and would be satisfied, at this stage, in case respondent No.1-State takes a decision regarding the same, in accordance with law, in a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the said representation in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of submission of the same.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of in the following terms: -

- (i) It would be open to the petitioner to give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-State within a period of two weeks from today.
- (ii) In case any such representation is filed by the petitioner, competent authority of respondent No.1-State would consider the same within a period of three months from the date of submission of the said representation and in case after considering the said representation, the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to him as expeditiously as possible. In case the competent authority of respondent No.1-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three months.

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-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

February 15, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No