

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

(300)

CWP-935-2020

Date of Decision : May 20, 2022

Shakuntla

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Deepak Kundu, Advocate, for
Mr. Tribhuvan Dahiya, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Singla, AAG, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

In the present petition, the grievance of the petitioner is that the service of the petitioner rendered by her from 25.07.1983 to 31.03.1990 on an aided sanctioned post, be taken into account as a qualifying service for computing the pensionary benefits.

After notice of motion, reply has been filed. In paragraph 3 of the short reply filed, it has been mentioned that the said service has already been taken into account as a qualifying service and a copy of PPO and GPO has been attached with the reply.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not rebut the said fact.

As the claim of the petitioner has already been extended to the petitioner, no further grievance of the petitioner survives in the present petition and the same is disposed of having been rendered infructuous.

May 20, 2022

harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No