

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

118

CWP-12642-2018

Date of Decision: May 18, 2018

Bindu

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. J.S. Rozera, Advocate for the petitioner.

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The grievance of the petitioner is that he is being replaced by a deputationist.

The action can be said to be illegal only if there is a single post and deputationist is being sent against that post. From the record, it is not clear whether there is a single post or that the petitioner is being relieved.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition, with liberty to make appropriate representation to the State Government. In case, an adverse order is passed against him, he seeks liberty to challenge the same.

The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforementioned liberty.

In case, the representation is made by the petitioner, the same shall be decided by passing a speaking order thereupon within a period of two weeks from the date of the representation.

May 18, 2018

sonia arora

**[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes

Whether Reportable :

No