

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(231)

CWP-26323-2022

Date of Decision : November 24, 2022

Premlata

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. V.K. Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner has already been reinstated in service though, in the order passed, it is being wrongly mentioned as reappointed. Learned counsel for the respondents on instructions from Mr. Khushi Ram, Superintendent, Mid-day Meal O/o Director Elementary Education, Haryana submits that though, the order on file has been passed by the competent authority for reinstatement in service of the petitioner but due to a typographical mistake in the consequent order, it has been mentioned as reappointment, which word may be read as 'reinstatement in service' instead of 'reappointment'.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the same and submits that though the petitioner has now been allowed to continue in

service but she was not allowed to discharge the duties by the respondents, which act was illegal, hence, the petitioner is entitled for the salary for the period she remained out of service, for which period, the petitioner be given liberty to approach the respondents by filing appropriate representation.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case any such representation is filed by the petitioner, the same will be considered in accordance with law and appropriate order will be passed within a period of eight weeks.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the above, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

Ordered accordingly.

November 24, 2022
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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