

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-17892-2018

Date of decision: 02.08.2018

Manjit

...Petitioner

V/s.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI.

Present: Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral).

The grievance of the petitioner is that she was appointed as a Clerk on 16.02.2009 as per the appointment letter (Annexure P-3) by Chhotu Ram Institute of Law, Rohtak and thereafter she was confirmed on 10.09.2010 (Annexure P-4). However, she had been relieved vide order dated 07.01.2011 (Annexure P-5) on the ground that there is no workload for non-teaching posts in the college.

An advertisement dated 28.06.2018 (Annexure P-6) has been published for the post of two Clerks and one Chowkidar under the self financing scheme by the said institute. The petitioner is seeking direction that the respondents should give her preference for appointment in the institute and she has also made a representation in this regard (Annexure P-7). However, her prayer is liable to be rejected as way back in the year 2011, she had been relieved and relieving order was passed on 07.01.2011 as per condition No. 3 of the appointment letter. Since the fresh advertisement has been issued, no direction can be given to the respondents to give her preference.

Dismissed.

02.08.2018

Divyanshi

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No