

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(243)

CM-13668-CWP-2023 in/and
CWP-16006-2022
Date of decision: - 09.10.2023

Monika Sharma

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Ganesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate,
for the applicant-petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

CM-13668-CWP-2023

1. Present application has been filed under Section 151 CPC to stay notice/letter dated 11.08.2023 (Annexure P-13), vide which, the appointments are being given to Female Constable (General Duty) Category 02 in EWS Category against Advertisement No.04./2020.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner has submitted the main writ petition is fixed for hearing on 04.12.2023 and prays that the main case be preponed to today.
3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the respondent-State has no objection to the same.

4. In view of the above-said facts and circumstances, the main writ petition is preponed to today and is taken up for hearing.

5. Present application stands disposed of.

CWP-16006-2022

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to include the name of the petitioner in the revised final result for the post of Female Constable (General Duty) Category 02 in EWS category as her name is not included in the revised final result dated 17.06.2022 (Annexure P-8) with respect to the final result dated 15.12.2021 (Annexure P-7).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioner, the petitioner would give a detailed representation with respect to the same and prays that the Secretary, Haryana Staff Selection Commission (respondent No.3) be directed to consider the same, in accordance with law, in a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant her the appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said representation in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of submission of the same.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of in the following terms: -

(i) It would be open to the petitioner to give a detailed

representation to respondent No.3.

- (ii) In case any such representation is filed by the petitioner, respondent No.3 would consider the same within a period of two months from the date of submission of said representation and in case after considering the said representation, respondent No.3 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to her as expeditiously as possible. In case the respondent No.3 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of two months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

October 09, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No