

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

CWP No. 16277 of 2013 (O & M)

Date of decision: 28.07.2017

Rani Devi Gupta

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Namit Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajinder Goyal, Advocate,
for respondents no. 4 to 6.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

Counsels are ad idem to the extent that part of the relief sought by the petitioner no longer subsists since the private respondent no. 6, who was appointed as a Principal of the respondent no. 4-School, has since resigned. It is the case of the petitioner himself that thereafter also, the petitioner was promoted as Principal on 21.10.2015 and subsequently retired on 31.05.2016 and, therefore, the relief as such claimed to that extent does not subsists.

Counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the only grievance would be as to whether the petitioner would be entitled for the benefits of promotion for the prior period. He submits that he would file a detailed representation as such with the respondents, who could take into consideration the same and take a decision on the same within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the said request.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of in the above said terms.

28.07.2017
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No

