

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(113)

CWP No. 21278 of 2023
Date of Decision : 22.09.2023

Anamika Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rose Gupta, Advocate,
Ms. Neha Anand Mahajan, Advocate and
Mr. Sukhvinder Singh Plaha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the claim of the petitioner for the grant of extension in service was declined by the respondents vide Annexure P-8. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that though the claim of the petitioner was rejected for extension of tenure but now the extension in service has been given to the members of Consumer Commissions vide order dated 31.08.2023, hence, the petitioner has been discriminated for the grant of the same benefit, which is not permissible.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Pankaj Middha, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that without raising any grievance before the authorities concerned, the petitioner has filed the present petition and in case, the petitioner raises the said grievance before the authorities concerned, an appropriate order will be passed in accordance with law within a period of eight weeks of receipt of any such grievance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to file an appropriate representation with the respondents claiming the relief of extension in service.

Ordered accordingly.

September 22, 2023
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No