

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(242)

CWP-21776-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision : November 29, 2022

Rupinder Kaur

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Lalit Rishi, Advocate, and
Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Maan, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate, for respondent No.5.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

CM-15468-CWP-2022

Present application has been filed for impleading the applicant
as party respondent to the present writ petition.

Notice of the application has already been issued.

Reply to the application has been filed in the Court today and
the same is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the respondents raises no objection for the
grant of the prayer as raised in the present application.

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, the
same is allowed and applicant Gourav Sharma son of Sh. Hori Lal, aged 31

years, resident of House No.D/31, Chaudhary Devi Lal, University, Sirsa is impleaded as respondent No.5 in the present petition.

CM-15469-CWP-2022

As prayed for, the application is allowed.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

CM-15489-CWP-2022

As prayed for, the application is allowed.

CM-15490-CWP-2022

As prayed for, application is allowed.

Written statement on behalf of respondent No.5 is taken on record.

CWP-21776-2022

In the present petition, the grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner was earlier working as Guest Faculty and she was relieved from service.

After relieving the petitioner, the respondents had issued an advertisement for seeking appointment of the Guest Faculties, which according to the petitioner, was not in accordance with law as the petitioner had a preferential right of adjustment having been already worked on the post in question.

After notice of motion, the respondents have filed the reply wherein, the respondents have stated that keeping in view the workload which still exists, advertisement is withdrawn.

Keeping in view the reply filed, the grievance of the petitioner that instead of petitioner, the respondents were intending to employ some other Guest Lecturers, has been rendered infructuous.

The only question which remains is whether, the petitioner is entitled for re-adjustment in the respondent-College or not keeping in view the instructions issued by the Government of Haryana.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case the petitioner is of the view that she is entitled for the re-adjustment in the respondent-College, she can approach the respondents by filing appropriate representation stating her grievance and considering her claim according the instructions, the said claim will be decided by the respondents within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of any such representation and appropriate order on the same will be passed and in case, it is found that the petitioner's claim is meritorious, appropriate relief will be granted otherwise, a speaking order giving the reasons for not accepting the plea, will be passed by the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further, with liberty as prayed for.

Ordered accordingly.

November 29, 2022
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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