

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.18159 of 2013
Date of Decision: 05.08.2015

Manju Bala

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and ors.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

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

Present: Mr.Vivek Khatri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. Sushil Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has sought re-employment and as well direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for re-employment for decision of representations (Annexure P-11 dated 12.04.1999, Annexure P-12 dated 17.05.2000 and Annexure P-13 dated 29.06.2000).

It has been submitted that the petitioner was appointed as Peon under the Ex-gratia scheme on death of her mother in compliance of letter No.30570 G1/G2 dated 10.12.1997 and she joined the service on 24.12.1997. However, submitted an application for resignation on 10.08.1998 indicating the reasons. The resignation has been accepted on 18.01.1999, thereafter the petitioner was voltefaced and submitted various representations for taking her back into the job/re-employment.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that compassionate view be taken in favour of petitioner, who had submitted a resignation letter under the compelling circumstances.

Dr. Sushil Gautam, DAG, Haryana submits that there is no provision in the Rules for giving the re-employment after resignation has been accepted. The petitioner was well within her right to withdraw the resignation before acceptance. Acceptance has been annexed as Annexure R-4/18.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There is no provision in the Rules, much less, any law till date where the resignation has been accepted & thereafter the person can be permitted to approbate and reprobate by taking complete summersault and seek re-employment.

Assuming for the sake of arguments, though not admitted the allegation/circumstances stated in letter of resignation to be true even though, the petitioner had numerous/various remedies to enforce. There is no merit in the present writ petition.

Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed.

August 05, 2015
pawan

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE