

Sr. No.113

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

CWP No.24339 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:27.10.2017

Sukhpal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Vaneet Kumar Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

The instant writ petition is directed against the order dated 17.02.2017 (Annexure P-3) issued by the office of the Director, Education Department (Elementary Education), Punjab and vide which the petitioner while serving as ETT Teacher has been denied promotion to the post of Head Teacher.

Counsel argues that the respondents have initiated a process to promote ETT Teachers and in such process juniors to the petitioner have been considered and whereas without any justifiable basis, petitioner is being denied her right for consideration for promotion to the post of Head Teacher.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

Perusal of Memo dated 17.02.2017 (Annexure P-3) reveals that the District Education Officer (Elementary Education), Barnala had considered the case of eligible ETT Teachers for promotion as Head Teachers in the month of September, 2016. Petitioner at that point of time fell within the zone of consideration. However, an affidavit dated 05.09.2016 was furnished by the

petitioner foregoing such promotion and deposing that she did not want to be promoted on the promotional post. On such ground, petitioner is stated to have been debarred for purposes of promotion for two years by the District Education Officer (Elementary Education).

The contents of memo dated 17.02.2017 (Annexure P-3) are not disputed by the counsel.

There is no challenge in the instant petition to the order whereby the petitioner had been debarred for two years for consideration for promotion to the post of Head Teacher. That apart there is also no challenge to any instruction/decision taken by the competent authority in the light of which the petitioner had been debarred for two years for promotion in the light of fact that she had chosen to forego the benefit of the promotional post.

In view of the above, no interference in the instant petition is called for.

Petition dismissed.

27.10.2017

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No