

304

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP- 9067-1999 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION:-24.02.2020

MRS. ARUN BALA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Mr. D.R. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Mr. Aakash Sridhar, Advocate for
Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Advocate
for respondents No. 6 to 9.

RITU BAHRI, J.(Oral)

In the present case, the petitioner is seeking issuance of writ of Mandamus by directing the respondents to extend the benefit to the petitioner accrued to her in pursuance of order dated 27.01.1998 (Annexure P-1) whereby her services were regularized w.e.f. 01.11.1986 instead of 31.12.1990 at par with her juniors and further for the directions to the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 06.08.1998 (Annexure P-2).

Reply has been filed by the respondents. In preliminary objections, it has been stated that the petitioner has been regularized w.e.f. 01.11.1986 in pursuance to the directions given by this Court in CWP No. 6267 of 1996. In para No. 2 (vi), it is further mentioned that the CWP No. 6267 of 1996 with other employees was allowed on 16.01.1997. The petitioner thereafter filed

COCP No. 1366 of 1997 which was also dismissed by this Court. The department referred the case of the petitioner to respondent No. 1 for guidance and the State Government vide letter dated 08.12.1997 (Annexure R-4/5), relaxed condition No. (ii) under which it was stated that the candidate should be appointed through Employment Exchange or non-availability certificate should be obtained. After giving relaxation, the department vide order No. 64 dated 27.01.1998 regularized the services of the petitioner as Senior Scale Stenographer w.e.f. 01.11.1986 instead of the earlier date of regularization of 31.12.1990. The petitioner, in this process, superseded 18 Senior Scale Stenographer besides Assistants, Clerks and Steno-typists. A copy of gradation list of the year 1997 and 1999 is attached as Annexure R-4/6.

Since the main relief as sought by the petitioner has already been granted, no further directions are required to be given in the present case.

Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not in touch with his client and also not received any further instructions in this case.

In view of the above situation, no further direction is called for. The present petition is disposed of.

24th February, 2020
shabha

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*