

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

**CWP No. 11108 of 2019
Date of Decision : 30.04.2019**

Mito Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J.(Oral)

In the present writ petition, the grievance of the petitioner is that she was appointed in the year 1998 and continued working as a part time employee till 30.04.2013 when she attained the age of superannuation. After 2013, one Raj Kumar, who was appointed much after the petitioner and was junior to her, his services were regularized vide order dated 22.05.2018 w.e.f. 01.04.2011.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that if the services of a junior person can be regularized w.e.f. 01.04.2011, when the petitioner was in service, the petitioner was entitled for the same benefit.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that for the relief, which has been claimed in the present writ petition, the petitioner has served the respondents with a legal notice dated 16.01.2019 (Annexure P-8) and the petitioner will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is

issued to the respondents to decide the legal notice dated 16.01.2019 (Annexure P-8) by passing a speaking order.

Without going into the merits of the case or expressing any opinion to the entitlement of the petitioner in respect of the relief claimed in the present writ petition or in the legal notice, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to pass an appropriate speaking order on the claim raised by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 16.01.2019 (Annexure P-8) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

April 30, 2019
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? *Yes*
Whether reportable? *No*