



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

CWP-9429-2019

Date of Decision:12.12.2025

SUDAGAR SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. R.K. Arora, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Prabhat K. Jalbera, Advocate
Mr. J.S. Bhogal, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam Ahuja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Respondent No.3 proceeded against *ex parte*.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer for issuance of an appropriate writ or order in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the impugned action of respondent No.1 in proceeding to fill the vacant post under handicapped quota from amongst the physically handicapped (ortho) category employee, respondent No.3 by ignoring the claim of the petitioner (Deaf and Dumb), who is entitled to be considered against roster point No.40. The petitioner further seeks a direction to the official respondents to grant him promotion



to the post of Senior Executive/Assistant under the 3% reservation quota for promotion against roster point No. 40 and to grant him conveyance allowance as per Punjab Government Instructions dated 22.05.2017 (Annexure P-14) and the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 12.12.2013 in Writ Petition (Civil) No.107 of 2011 (Annexure P-13).

2. At the very outset, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the grievance raised in the present petition has been partially redressed. However, the promotion has not been granted from the deemed date in terms of the relevant roster point and the admissible benefits claimed in the petition have also not been released from the due date. It is submitted that although the petitioner has now been promoted, his grievance regarding the new date of promotion as per the roster point, as well as the release of admissible benefits from the due date remains pending. The petitioner has already submitted a representation/demand notice in this regard on 03.11.2025, a copy of which has been supplied to learned counsel for the respondents. Learned Senior Counsel further submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide the representation/demand notice dated 03.11.2025 by passing a speaking order within a time-bound period.

3. Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his memo of appearance, which is taken on record.

4. Learned State Counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 submit that they have no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decide the



representation/demand notice dated 03.11.2025 filed by the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation/demand notice dated 03.11.2025 filed by the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of three months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondents.

6. Disposed of, accordingly, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

12.12.2025
P.Bhatt

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>