



CWP-6668-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(138)

CWP-6668-2025
Date of Decision : 10.03.2025

Vinod Kumar ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. C.S. Jattana, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. The grievance, which propelled the petitioner to file the instant writ petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking a mandamus upon the respondent No.2, is that his application dated 09.12.2024 (Annexure P-3), for grant of compensation due to accident/injury to him, on account of stray animal attack, has yet not been decided by the respondent No.2.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied in case, a mandamus is passed upon the respondent No.2, to decide the application (supra), so preferred by the petitioner, in a time bound manner.
3. The prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is *bona fide* and innocuous.
4. At this stage, without issuing notice in the instant writ petition, this Court deems it fit and appropriate, to pass a mandamus, upon the respondent No.2, to decide the application (supra), preferred by the petitioner, within a period of three months, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order/judgment.
5. **Disposed of** accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

March 10, 2025

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