



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

CWP-19856-2026

Date of Decision : **14.07.2026**

RUPINDER KAUR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr.Amit Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. This Court on 06.07.2026, had passed the hereinafter
extracted order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that the petitioner was appointed as a Math Mistress under the Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan in the year 2009, whereas respondent No. 5 was appointed as a Math Mistress in the year 2012. It is further submitted that the services of both the petitioner and respondent No. 5 were regularised in the year 2019, subject to the condition that no benefit of the past service rendered by them would be admissible.

He further submits that, while considering the cases of the petitioner and respondent No. 5 for transfer to their home district, the competent authority erroneously granted the benefit of past experience to respondent No. 5 by awarding 7 marks, whereas no such benefit was extended to the petitioner. Consequently, the marks awarded for the purpose of transfer to home districts and the final merit list have been prepared erroneously.

At this stage, without issuing notice, Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab, who appears on advance notice, is directed to produce the relevant record before this Court to demonstrate the basis on which the marks were awarded to the petitioner and respondent No. 5 for considering their claim for transfer to their home district.

Adjourned to **14.07.2026**.

It is made clear that non-compliance with the aforesaid direction shall invite appropriate adverse orders against the official respondents.”

2. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Ms. Parminder Kaur, Assistant Director, Director School Edu, Punjab, submits that on account of some typographical mistake/error, respondent no.5 was erroneously awarded 7 marks. He further submits, on instructions, that the authority concerned, is now in the process of reviewing the case of petitioner as well as respondent no.5, and will pass a fresh order in this regard.

3. In view of the above statement, no further direction is required to be passed, at this stage. Accordingly, the instant petition, is **closed**.

4. It is made clear that aforesaid exercise shall be carried out within a period of 20 days, from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

5. It goes without saying that, in case the respondent authorities, does not pass fresh order, within the stipulated time period, she would be at liberty to get the instant petition revived, by filing an apposite application.

6. **Disposed of** accordingly.

7. All pending application(s), if any, also stand **disposed** of accordingly.

July 14, 2026
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No