

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 27025 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 23.12.2016

Geeta Devi Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Ms. Harmanpreet Kaur (Simmi), Advocate, for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

:-

:-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has impugned the orders dated 31.8.2015, 17.9.2013, 31.8.2015 (Annexures-P-2 to P-4 respectively), vide which the revisions filed by the petitioner against the order dated 11.3.2013, have been rejected on the ground of limitation. It comes out that the husband of the petitioner Constable Ranbir Singh was awarded punishment of stoppage of four annual increments with permanent effect, vide order dated 11.3.2013. He was also awarded punishment of stoppage of ten annual increments with permanent effect, order dated 17.9.2013 (Annexure-P- 3), which was reduced to five annual increment with permanent effect, as orally informed by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Constable Ranbir Singh did not challenge the said orders and expired on 23.12.2014. After his death, the present petitioner (his wife) filed the revision against the said orders, which has been dismissed being time barred.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the

CWP No. 27025 of 2016 (O/M)

view that the petitioner claims her rights through her husband and when four and ten annual increments, which was reduced to five annual increments, were stopped with cumulative effect, it gave cause of action to the husband of the petitioner to file appeal against the said orders. The orders were apparently passed after regular inquiry. The said appeal was never filed and, therefore, the said orders have become final. Now, after more than two years of passing of the said order, these cannot be reopened on the ground that the petitioner was not aware about these orders. There is no ground to interfere in the impugned order. Therefore, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

23.12.2016
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No