

119

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-20810-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.09.2023

Nitin Sood
Vs.
State of Punjab and others
..... Petitioner
..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr. Sharwan Sehgal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been given a time table which he has mentioned in para 6 of his writ petition relating to the work assigned to him at Ludhiana as a part-time teacher in subject of Physics.
2. Learned counsel submits vide annexure P-2, the petitioner has been asked to perform duties at Government College, Malerkotla on Friday and Saturday and thus he is being asked to work on both the days at Malerkotla as well as Ludhiana, which cannot be possibly done by him as he cannot be working at two places on the same day.
3. I have considered the submissions.
4. The interpretation and understanding of the orders dated 11.09.2023 by the petitioner is wholly misconceived. The time table assigned to the petitioner, as quoted by him in para 6 of the writ petition, is the previous time table as assigned while he was working as a part-time

Physics teacher at Ludhiana alone. However, the order annexure P-2 specifically mentions that the said order dated 11.09.2023 amends the earlier orders passed by the Cluster Incharge and the petitioner has been asked to perform his duties on Friday and Saturday at Government College, Malerkotla. The same therefore has to be read to mean that the petitioner would not be working on Friday and Saturday at Ludhiana.

- 5. The Writ Petition thus is wholly misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.
- 6. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

September 21, 2023
Mohit goyal

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/No |