

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 21221 of 2017

Date of Decision: 18.09.2017

Sheela Devi

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. R.S. Sangwan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that with regard to the petitioners' grievance, on not promoting her to the post of Superintendent from the date that her juniors, i.e. respondents no. 4 and 5 herein were promoted, she has made a representation to the Director General of Police, Haryana, i.e. respondent no. 2, on 29.07.2016, a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-11 with the petition but it has not been decided so far.

She is also stated to have filed an appeal against the punishment of stoppage of two increments with temporary effect, imposed vide the order of the DGP, dated 12.04.2016, a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-5 with the petition.

Learned counsel further draws attention to the instructions, Annexure P-18, dated 19.07.1973, clause 3 of which stipulates that even if an employee has been imposed a punishment of stoppage of increments and in the meanwhile his/her case for promotion comes up, the punishment of stoppage of increments

Nitin
2017.09.29 12:58
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

would be ignored and instead the overall service record of the employee would be taken into account, for promoting him/her.

Consequently, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no. 1 to take a decision on the appeal of the petitioner against the imposition of punishment of stoppage of two annual increments (without cumulative effect), within a period of three months, with a further direction to the DGP/competent authority, to consider the case of the petitioner for promotion to the post of Superintendent, in terms of the instructions Annexure P-18 and/or any subsequent instructions on the subject, and to pass a speaking order in terms of such instructions, also within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

September 18, 2017
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No.