

Party Name : TULI BHATTACHARJEE (CHAKRABORTY) Vs STATE OF TRIPURA & 6 ORS

---

THE HONBLE MR JUSTICE U. B. SAHA

---

When the matter is taken up for hearing, Mr. Deb, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially the State respondents, in their counter affidavit stated that the petitioner was not provided job as her husband was serving under the Government but subsequently the State filed another affidavit wherein it is stated that the petitioner&&&&s husband is not a government employee. He further contended that while rejecting the prayer of the petitioner probably there was some wrong assumption as the petitioner was not provided job on the ground that the husband of the petitioner was a government servant. In view of that, he wants to withdraw the instant writ petition and file a representation before the respondent-authority, stating all the facts. Learned Advocate General also submits that if the petitioner files a representation then the State will consider the same in its true spirit. It appears from the record that by this time the petitioner has become over aged. However, if the petitioner files a representation before the concerned authority then the said authority should consider that when she applied for the post, she was within the prescribed age limit. Therefore, the age bar should not stand on the way for debarring her from getting job, subject to, she fulfils the other conditions. This Court hopes and trusts that the concerned authority will consider the case of the petitioner taking note of all the facts mentioned in the representation. The aforesaid order is passed as agreed to by the learned counsel for the parties. It is needless to say that if the petitioner is aggrieved by the order of the authority, she is at liberty to approach the Court again, in accordance with law. With the aforesaid order, the instant writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn.