

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

CWP No.13955 of 2015
Date of decision: 15.07.2015

Hansa Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

A writ in the nature of certiorari is prayed for, so as to quash the seniority list dated 31.05.2015, vide which the petitioner has been shown junior to respondent No.4, and the same is in breach of the statutory rules framed by the Government. Petitioners were promoted as Central Head Teacher (CHT) on 14.07.2008. In the seniority lists dated 31.08.2012 & 31.07.2013, name of petitioner No.1 was reflected at serial No.5 and one Sukhwinder Devi was shown at serial Nos.8 & 9, respectively. Raksha Rani was shown at serial Nos.6 & 4 and Satish Kumar, who happened to be the junior-most in the seniority list, was shown at serial Nos.27 & 21, respectively. Likewise, name of petitioner No.2 was shown at serial No.8 in the seniority list dated 31.08.2012 and at serial No.9 in the seniority list dated 31.07.2013. Both the

petitioners belong to General Category. However, in the seniority list that has now been issued on 31.05.2015, name of the petitioner No.1 is shown at serial No.15 and Raksha Rani is reflected at serial No.11, whereas Satish Kumar, who happened to be the junior-most in the earlier list, is shown at serial No.1. And for no tangible reason, name of the petitioner No.2 has been reflected at the end of the list. Likewise, persons, who are purported to be junior to petitioner No.2, have been assigned position above him in the seniority list. Prior to the institution of this petition, petitioners claimed to have even represented to the respondents vide their respective representations dated 08.06.2015 (Annexure P9) and dated 05.06.2015 (Annexure P10). But to no avail.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that let this petition, at this stage, be disposed of only with a direction to respondents No.1 to 3, to consider and decide the representations (Annexures P9 & P10), submitted by the petitioners, within a specified time.

That being so, and without expressing any opinion on merit, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.1 to 3, to consider and decide the claim of the petitioners, as set out in their representations dated 08.06.2015 (Annexure P9) and dated 05.06.2015 (Annexure P10), strictly in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order.

Needless to assert, a comprehensive order shall be passed,
assigning reasons in support of the decision arrived at.

July 15 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge