

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(107)

CWP No. 7608 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 02.06.2020

Lalit Bhardwaj

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. D.K. Bhatti, Advocate for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

File has been taken for hearing through video conference due to Covid-19 pandemic.

CM-4940-CWP-2020

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CWP-7608-2020

Present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 01.04.2020 (Annexure P-4) by which he was suspended from the post of TGT S.S. Master while working in Government Senior Secondary School Mujessar, District Faridabad.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is aggrieved against fixing of his Head Quarters at Panchkula rather than Faridabad and is being made to travel to Panchkula

from Faridabad in the present situation. Learned counsel for the petitioner

further submits that suspension allowance after the suspension has not been paid till today.

Ms. Shruti Jain, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, who has also joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, appears on behalf of respondent-State and states that she has instructions to say that the Head Quarters of the petitioner will be treated as Faridabad instead of Panchkula and, therefore, grievance of the petitioner in that regard stands redressed. With regard to payment of suspension allowance w.e.f. 01.04.2020, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State submits that appropriate order releasing the suspension allowance of the petitioner will be passed within a period of two weeks from today and all the payments for which the petitioner is entitled under the rules governing the service for the period petitioner is under suspension, will be paid to the petitioner within a period of 10 days thereafter.

Keeping in view the statement made by learned counsel for the respondent-State, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed and he does not wish to press this writ petition any further.

Petition stands disposed of having been not pressed.

It is made clear that respondent-State will be bound by the statement recorded above.

June 02, 2020
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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