

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

CWP No.14538 of 2015  
Date of decision: 22.07.2015

Meena Kumari Jain

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. Raman B. Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

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 mandamus is prayed for, so as to direct the respondents to consider and promote the petitioner as SS Mistress w.e.f. 09.10.2001 i.e. the date on which the identically placed persons, namely, Vijay Lakshmi and Harjinder Pal Kaur were promoted with all consequential benefits. The petitioner was appointed as JBT teacher on 25.01.1984 on 89 days basis and she continued in service till 16.04.1987 with notional breaks. In view of the regularization policy, services of the petitioner were to be regularized w.e.f. 01.04.1985, on completion of one year satisfactory service. However, it was pursuant to an order passed by this court on 17.04.2012, her services were regularized w.e.f. 01.04.1985, vide order dated 23.01.2013. As a consequence, petitioner was paid most of the benefits including the arrears of salary

etc. Except that she was not afforded promotion to the post of SS Mistress on 9.10.2001 despite the fact that the similarly situated persons, namely, Vijay Lakshmi and Harjinder Pal Kaur, were regularized as JBT teachers on 05.12.1991 and 10.07.1992, respectively. Not just that, a sum of ₹ 33,913/- was deposited in the General Provident Fund on October, 2013, though the department was required to deposit the same much prior to the said date and thus, the petitioner is also entitled to the interest on the said amount on account of delayed deposit. As regards her grievance, the petitioner purports to have served a legal notice upon the respondents on 07.06.2014 (Annexure P4). But that too has failed to evoke any response.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that let this petition, at this stage, be disposed of only with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the notice (Annexure P4), served by the petitioner, within a specified time.

That being so, and without expressing any opinion on merit, this petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner, as set out in her legal notice dated 07.06.2014(Annexure P4), 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 22, 2015  
Rajan

**( Arun Palli )**  
**Judge**