



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Letters Patent Appeal No.1270 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.05.2024

Tarandeep Kaur

.....Appellant

versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI, JUDGE

Present : Mr. V.P.Sangwan, Advocate, for the appellant.

Ms. Neha Jain, Senior Panel Counsel for respondent No.7.

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate, for respondent No.8.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

Challenge is to the interim order dated 13.05.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in Civil Writ Petition No. 10528 of 2024 wherein interim protection was granted to the writ petitioner (respondent No.8 herein)-Rajbeer Kaur keeping in view the order dated 24.04.2024 passed by a Division Bench in Letters Patent Appeal No. 906 of 2024 (*Iqbal Singh vs. Union of India*).

2. Learned counsel for the appellant has vehemently submitted that the writ petitioner having taken part as such in the selection process could not have then challenged the appointment letter dated 13.05.2023 (Annexure P-10) issued in favour of the appellant.

3. It is not disputed that the writ petitioner is working as contractual employee since the year 2014. It is only for a brief period of two years she did not serve the respondents between the years 2020-2021 and 2022-2023 due to

the reason she was on maternity leave. Thereafter from the year 2022 onwards also she served the respondents before her services were dispensed with. Thus keeping in view the period of service between the present appellant and the private respondent we are of the considered opinion that the learned Single Judge has balanced the equity as such and granted interim protection during the pendency of the writ petition more so keeping in view the fact that this issue is hanging fire before the Apex Court.

4. Resultantly, being an interim order as such, we are of the considered opinion that the view taken by the learned Single Judge does not suffer from any infirmity which would warrant our interference in the present Letters Patent Appeal. Resultantly, the appeal is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(G.S.SANDHAWALIA)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

22.05.2024

ravinder

Whether speaking/reasoned	√Yes/No
Whether reportable	√Yes/No