

for two years i.e. from 01.08.2005 to 31.07.2007, but without completing his studies, and without obtaining the degree, the petitioner represented for re-joining the duty on 18.08.2006. Vide letter dated 23.08.2006, the petitioner was allowed to join the duties but subject to the final decision of the competent Authority in this regard i.e. the Director, Technical Education and Industrial Training, Punjab at Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as – the Director). While the matter was pending with the Director, on account of audit objections, in view of the petitioner's joining his duties before the expiry of the study leave and without obtaining the degree for which he had taken leave, an amount of ₹ 1,52,374/- was sought to be recovered from the petitioner. This action on the part of the respondents has been challenged by the petitioner through the present writ petition.

During the pendency of the present writ petition, the Director has, vide letter dated 20.09.2012, permitted the Principal (Campus Director) of the College to take a final decision in the matter. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the College, submits that in view of the above authorization to the Principal, as given vide letter dated 20.09.2012 by the Director, to finally decide the issue, the petitioner may now make a representation for the vindication of his grievance and if such representation is made, the same be decided in accordance with law.

In view of the above stand taken on behalf of the respondent College, which I find to be reasonable, the petitioner may make a

representation to the Principal of the respondent College for the grievance that he has raised in the present writ petition. If any such representation is made, the same is directed to be decided within three months from the date of receipt of such representation, by passing a speaking order and after granting hearing to the petitioner.

Needless to say that the decision so taken by the respondent College on the representation filed by the petitioner shall be communicated to the petitioner and if the petitioner is still not satisfied with the decision, he will be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

March 30, 2015

monika