

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

**CWP No.26481 of 2016
Date of Decision: 21.12.2016**

Usha Yadav and others

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Kuldip Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioners.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioners are stated to be working as Extension Lecturers in Government College, Narnaul. The details of the period of their service as Extension Lecturers and their qualifications are set out are mentioned in para No.3 of the petition.

It is the case of the petitioners that they deserve to continue as Extension Lecturers till regular appointments are made by the respondents and they should not to be relieved during summer/winter/examination period. The petitioners have sought further direction that they be granted ` 1000/- per period subject to a maximum of ` 25,000/- per month from the date of their initial appointment.

Issue notice to the respondents.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Learned counsel for the petitioners has furnished five sets of the paper book to learned counsel for the respondents-State.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the cases of the petitioners are squarely covered by the judgment of a coordinate

Bench of this Court in the case of “***Ms. Menka and others vs. State of Haryana and others***” in ***CWP No. 9300 of 2015*** decided on **05.05.2016**.

Learned State counsel contends that a coordinate Bench of this Court has issued directions pertaining to similarly situated persons while deciding ***CWP No. 16975 of 2014***, in the case of “***Mrs. Rita Tandon vs. State of Haryana and others***”, decided on **29.07.2016** while relying upon the judgment in the case of ***Ms. Menka and others vs. State of Haryana and others (supra)***.

At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners would be satisfied if the petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of each of the petitioners in the light of the judgments in the cases of ***Ms. Menka and others vs. State of Haryana and others (supra)*** and ***Mrs. Rita Tandon vs. State of Haryana and others (supra)*** in a time bound manner.

Therefore, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to treat the writ petition as a representation of the petitioners and consider and decide the same by passing a speaking order, keeping in view the judgments in the cases of ***Ms. Menka and others vs. State of Haryana and others (supra)*** and ***Mrs. Rita Tandon vs. State of Haryana and others (supra)***, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

December 21, 2016

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No