

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

CWP-12293-2020

Date of decision:-20.8.2020

Sunita Goswami

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.MADAAN**

Present: Mr.Sanchit Punia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**H.S. MADAAN, J.**

Case taken up through video conferencing.

This civil writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed by petitioner – Sunita Goswami, aged about 28 years, wife of Suresh Kumar, working as PGT (Home Science) at Government Girls Senior Secondary School, Mangali, Hisar against State of Haryana through its Addl. Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, Department of School Education, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh, Department of Secondary Education Haryana, District Education Officer, Hisar, Block Education Officer, Hisar and Principal, Government Girls Senior Secondary School, Mangali, Hisar, craving for

issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for issuing directions to respondents to allow the petitioner to proceed on child care leave since her daughter needs intensive care being 19 months old.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner had submitted a representation Annexure P1 to the Principal, Government Girls Senior Secondary School, Mangali (Hisar) in that regard, without eliciting any response. Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the orders passed by this Court in CWP-2689-2020 and in CWP-14141-2019 under similar circumstances.

Notice of motion.

Mr.Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent – State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to respondents to consider her request as contained in her representation Annexure P-1 and more comprehensively detailed in the present writ petition within a fixed time frame.

Learned State counsel submits that the respondents would do so as per the directions issued by this Court.

In view of such request of learned counsel for the petitioner and response given by the State counsel and further to avoid any unnecessary litigation between the parties, the present petition is disposed of directing the respondents to consider the request/claim of the petitioner as contained in her representation Annexure P-1, more comprehensively detailed in the writ petition along with annexures, which be also

considered as a representation and to decide the same in accordance with law, by way of a speaking order within a period of four weeks from today.

However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved even after passing of the order, she may seek her legal remedy including approaching this Court as per law.

20.8.2020  
Brij

**(H.S.MADAAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No**

**Whether reportable : Yes/No**