

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

**CWP No.1582 of 2017
Date of decision:31.01.2017**

Suman Lata ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate, for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

As per the averments made in the present writ petition, though the enquiry is stated to be still pending against the petitioner, yet she has raised a question with regard to jurisdiction of the enquiry officer by relying upon the provisions of Article 243(O) of the Constitution of India and Sections 176 and 177 of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. In my view, the apprehension of the petitioner is totally misplaced as she has not been communicated with the outcome of the enquiry report though she has been associated with it.

Faced with the aforementioned situation, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave of the Court for withdrawal of the present writ petition with liberty to take all the pleas raised in the present writ petition before the concerned officer at an appropriate stage.

With the aforementioned observations, the writ petition is ordered to be dismissed as withdrawn with the liberty aforesaid.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

January 31, 2017

savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No