

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

**CWP No. 24734 of 2016
Date of Decision : 01.12.2016**

Darshana

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J.(Oral)

The petitioner is seeking direction to respondent No. 1 to decide the revision petition dated 18.08.2015 (Annexure P-11) against the order dated 21.08.2012 (Annexure P-8), whereby appeal filed by the husband of the petitioner has been rejected by the Director, Haryana State Roadways, Chandigarh.

The husband of the petitioner is stated to have been employed as Washing Boy on contractual basis with the Haryana Roadways, Delhi in the year 2004. It is stated that husband of the petitioner was suffering from liver disease and hence, he could not attend his duty from April, 2011 and his services were terminated vide order dated 13.12.2011 (Annexure P-4). The husband of the petitioner had preferred an appeal against the order of termination to the Director, State Transport Haryana, which was rejected vide order dated 21.08.2012 (Annexure P-8).

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that this order rejecting the appeal of the husband of the petitioner was communicated only on

02.12.2014. The husband of the petitioner expired on 11.04.2015. The petitioner thereafter preferred a revision petition dated 18.08.2015 to respondent No. 1 but no action has been taken thereon by respondent No. 1. Learned counsel further contends that several persons similarly situated as the husband of the petitioner have been regularized in the year 2013 and in case her husband is accorded similar relief, the petitioner would be entitled to consequential benefits.

Issue notice to respondents.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Harish Rathee, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Learned counsel for the petitioner has furnished copy of paper book to learned State counsel.

No reason has been spelt out by the Director, Haryana State Roadways, Chandigarh in the order rejecting the appeal of the husband of the petitioner. The case of the petitioner deserves fair consideration by the respondents.

Therefore, I deem it appropriate to dispose of this petition with a direction to respondent No. 1 to consider and decide the revision petition of the petitioner, in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

December 01, 2016.

kanchan

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes

Whether reportable?

No