

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

CWP No. 3934 of 2015(O&M)

Date of decision : 09.03.2015

Babli Devi

..... Petitioner

VS

Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board

and others

.....

Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singal, 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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel has argued that the case of the petitioner was recommended by respondent No.2 to respondent No.1 on 12.08.2014 by Annexure P-4. However, by a letter dated 01.10.2014 (Annexure P-5) respondent No.1 returned the recommendation with the observation that for the post which the petitioner was claiming the appointing authority was respondent No.2 itself. It is the contention of learned counsel that thereafter the petitioner moved a representation Annexure P-6 to respondent No.2 but no decision has been taken

thereon. Learned counsel states that at this stage the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is given to respondent No.2 to consider the case of the petitioner for regularisation.

I find this to be fair request.

Resultantly this petition is disposed of with a direction to consider the claim of the petitioner by passing a speaking order on his representation(Annexure P-6) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

March 09, 2015
sunita