

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

101

CWP No.21092 of 2016

Date of decision:10.10.2017

Ritu

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.Tehpal Singh Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner
Mr.R.K.Doon, AAG, Haryana
Mr.Saurabh Goel, Advocate,
for respondents no.2 to 4.

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondent Parishad, i.e. respondents no.2 to 4, submits that the petitioners' contract having expired on 30.6.2015 and thereafter renewed on 27.8.2015 with effect from 1.7.2015, and therefore since the earlier contract had come to an end on 30.6.2015, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit.

The contention is rejected outright for two reasons; i.e. firstly, the respondents themselves have granted the benefit to the petitioner vide the order (Annexure R-1), for the period 1.7.2015 to 24.11.2015. Secondly, this is obviously for the reason that though the contract was renewed on 27.8.2015, it was with effect from 1.7.2015. Obviously therefore, there was no gap at all between the period of working of the petitioner between 30.6.2015 and 1.7.2015.

Consequently, the petitioner is held entitled to the interest @ 6% per annum on the amount already paid. The directions be carried out

within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this Court. Costs of Rs.5,000/- shall also be paid to the petitioner.

Disposed of accordingly.

10.10.2017
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No