

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

CWP-13446-2018 (O & M)

Date of decision: 04.02.2019

Dr. R.C. Goyal

.... Petitioner

V/s

Union Territory, Chandigarh and ors.

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

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

Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate, for respondents No.1 to 3-U.T.

Rajan Gupta, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks a writ in the nature of certiorari. Petitioner has posed a challenge to order dated 16th April, 2018, Annexure P-10, passed by respondent No.3 rejecting his prayer for allotment of Government accommodation.

Stand of the respondents-Union Territory is that the petitioner is not covered under the definition of eligible employee under Rule 2 of 1996 Rules as he is a contractual employee and his service is nine days less than the subscribed period of three years.

Mr. Maanipur, however, points out that there is a provision of relaxation of this condition under the Rules.

Admittedly, an appeal has been preferred against the impugned order before the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh. Ms. Puri submits that earnest efforts shall be made to decide the appeal at the earliest.

In view of statement made by learned counsel for the respondents-Union Territory, no direction is necessary. Petition is hereby disposed of.

Till decision is taken on the appeal, petitioner will be allowed to continue in the Government accommodation.

February 04, 2019
sukhpreet

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

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