

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

CWP No.340 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.03.2017

Prubhdish Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. L.S. Virk, AAG Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant writ petition has been filed seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to promote the petitioner as Hindi Mistress, in view of the fact that the person junior to the respondent i.e. respondent No.4 had been promoted. The petitioner sought promotion being senior to respondent No.4 along with all the consequential benefits.

Mr. L.S. Virk, AAG Punjab, appearing on behalf of the respondents-State places on record an order dated 14.03.2017, wherein, DPI Secondary Education, Punjab, on reviewing the case of the petitioner, has come to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for notional promotion as Hindi Mistress w.e.f. 19.04.2006 from which date her junior was

promoted. The order further notices that the petitioner is entitled for promotion to master cadre w.e.f. 19.04.2006, subject to the condition that if in future promotion of junior Neeru Aggarwal is reviewed by the department, its decision shall be binding on the petitioner also and her case will be reviewed accordingly.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the fact that an order dated 14.03.2017 has been issued, giving promotion to the petitioner to master cadre as Hindi Mistress w.e.f. 19.04.2006, with certain reservations, no further orders are called for in the instant writ petition.

At this stage, Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the petitioner argues that he had prayed for consequential benefits as well, however, order dated 14.03.2017 only mentions that petitioner would be entitled for notional promotion.

This court is the view that since the said order has already been issued, it is left open to the petitioner to approach the department concerned for seeking any further relief, as claimed in the writ petition. In case, the petitioner does file the representation, the same be decided in accordance with law.

This writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

March 15, 2017

vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No