



CWP-34092-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(126)

CWP-34092-2024

Date of Decision : December 17, 2024

Rakesh Kumar

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Suverna Mutneja, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is entitled for regularization of his services as per the Policy dated 16.05.2023 (Annexure P-5) keeping in view the judgment of the Coordinate Bench of this Court passed in ***CWP No.19238 of 2013 titled as Amrish Sharma and others vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 26.02.2024*** and also for the grant of minimum of the pay scale as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***State of Punjab vs. Jagjit Singh (2017) 1 SCC 148***.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the grievance raised in the present petition has already been raised by the petitioner in the representation dated 23.11.2024 (Annexure P-6) which is

**CWP-34092-2024****2**

still pending 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 representation by passing an appropriate speaking order.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Arun Gupta, learned Deputy 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 representation dated 23.11.2024 (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.

December 17, 2024
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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