

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

Sr. No.115

CWP No.13463 of 2022

Date of Decision: 06.07.2022

Simlo Devi

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that in fact, without appreciating the actual controversy raised by the petitioner with regard to the counting of the adhoc service rendered by the petitioner from 05.01.1990 to 22.01.2015, the impugned order has been passed by respondent No.3 declining the petitioner the benefit of extension for a period of two years. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner only wanted that her total length of service be treated as a qualifying service for the purpose of computing her pensionary benefits, which question has not at all been looked into while passing the impugned order.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Anju Sharma Kaushik, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice and on instructions from Mr. P.S.Avtar Singh, Senior Assistant in the office of DEO (SE), Hoshiarpur, submits that the impugned order dated 03.01.2020 (Annexure P-8) be treated as withdrawn and a fresh order will be passed on the representation dated 14.10.2021 (Annexure P-6) moved by the petitioner, within a period of two months from today.

Keeping in view the statement of learned State counsel, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no further grievance of the petitioner survives in the present petition and the same may kindly be disposed of as having been not pressed any further.

Ordered accordingly.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

06.07.2022
Maninder

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