

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

(2251)

RSA No. 428 of 2011

Date of Decision:- 28.09.2016.

Dr. Kirpal Kaur Randhawa

.....Appellant(s)

VS

Mai Bhago College For Women, Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana
And Another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Anupam Sharma, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate
for the respondents.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to the order dated 20.09.2016, the respondents have filed an affidavit. Perusal of the affidavit nowhere it is stated that what is the definition of admissible allowances, which has been incorporated in the appointment order. Admittedly, appellant has not been granted any admissible allowances. In the absence of definition of admissible allowances inference cannot be drawn that HRA, DA and TA and other allowances. With reference to the appointment order the petitioner is entitled for admissible allowances. She is entitled to admissible allowances in the form of compensation.

Therefore, the respondents are directed to pay a sum of Rs.

75,000/- as compensation/admissible allowances for the service rendered by the appellant. The compensation/allowances shall be paid within a period of 3 months from today.

Accordingly, Appeal Stands disposed of.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 28, 2016.
sahil soni

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No.