

WP No. 3260/2010
Sayed Suhel Mumtaz
Vs.
State of M.P. & Ors.

1

31.08.2015

Shri D.K. Katare, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Vijay Sundaram, Panel Lawyer for respondents/State.

Shri Katare at the outset fairly submits that relief prayed for is granted to a great extent. Kramonnati benefits are already granted to the petitioner from due date. Although, the petitioner is promoted from back date but he has not been promoted from due date. In other-words, Shri Katare submits that petitioner claimed that he should be given promotion to the post of Inspector prior to his junior (respondent No.3). The respondents promoted him from a later date and therefore it is prayed that petitioner will prefer a detailed representation along with judgment in W.P.No.3012/2007 (Ajay Bhargav Vs. State of M.P. & Ors). It is prayed that if such representation is preferred along with judgment, respondents No.1 and 2 be directed to decide it expeditiously.

Shri Sundaram has no objection to this harmless prayer.

WP No. 3260/2010
Sayed Suhel Mumtaz
Vs.
State of M.P. & Ors.
2

Resultantly, petitioner is given liberty to prefer the representation in the manner prayed for. If such representation is preferred, the respondents No.1 and 2 are directed to consider and decide it by taking into account the judgment cited by the petitioner. The reasoned order be passed and communicated to the petitioner within 120 days from the date of communication of representation.

Petition is disposed of without expressing any view on the merits of the case.

(alok)

(Sujoy Paul)
Judge