



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

104

CWP-19791-2024

Date of decision: 11.09.2024

MOHAN LAL SHARMA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present writ petition has been filed seeking quashing of the order dated 23.11.2023 (Annexure P-9) passed by the Lokayukta, Haryana whereby the complaint filed by the petitioner was dismissed being devoid of merits. A further prayer has been made for issuing of directions to respondent No.2 to further direct respondent No.5 to resign from her previous post and consequentially deposit 03 months salary w.e.f. date of joining as principal i.e. 01.06.2016 alongwith interest applicable thereupon.

2. Briefly summarized the facts of the present case leading to filing of the present writ petition are that respondent No. 5 Smt. Abha Bansal joined as Assistant Professor, against sanctioned post, in respondent No.4- S.A. Jain (PG) College, Ambala City in the year 1994. In the year 2016, the management of the aforesaid college issued an advertisement for the vacant

**CWP-19791-2024****-2-**

post of Principal for which respondent No.5 was amongst the applicants. It is contended that as the respondent No. 4-College is a state-aided institution, it was required to associate two nominees from the Government, one from the affiliating University and another from the Education Department. It is contended that the appointment of respondent No. 5 was wrongly made by the College as per the Rules pertaining to the minority institutions in the State of Haryana. She was appointed as a Principal of the institution in a hasty manner and without following the due procedure of law.

3. It is further alleged that respondent No.5 was working as an Associate Professor in the college at the time of her appointment and she was required to resign from her previous post before joining as the Principal. She was also required to deposit three months salary, in lieu of the notice period, at the time of her joining. As a result of non-compliance of the aforesaid mandate, a financial loss of more than Rs. 4 lakhs has been caused. Aggrieved against the same, the petitioner filed various complaints to authorities but no heed was paid to the said complaints. Since no action was taken by the official respondents, hence complaint No. 01 of 2022 was filed before the Lokayukta, Haryana.

4. During the pendency of the said complaint, the Director General, Higher Education issued a communication dated 12.01.2022 to all the principals of government aided private colleges situated in the State of Haryana calling upon them not to exempt surrender of 03 months salary at the time of resignation from a post on the subsequent joining at another institution after availing extra-ordinary leave and reduced to one month's



CWP-19791-2024

-3-

salary, if joining the same institution. The relevant extract of the said decision reads thus:-

“ Subject: Regarding issue related to depositing of three months' salary in lieu of three months' notice period.

In continuation of this office letter No. 3/2-2002 C-IV (3) dated 14.01.2011.

It was decided that exemption from depositing three months' salary cannot be given to those Lecturers (Assistant Professors) who joins another institution after availing Extra Ordinary Leave and later on submit resignation with three months' notice.

The Government has re-examined the issue and following: decision has been taken in this regard:-

- 1. One months' pay or one months' notice as per Haryana Affiliated Colleges (Security of Service) Rules 2006 has been made mandatory at the time of resignation before joining on the new post irrespective of the fact that the joining is to be made in the same college, same Management Committee or others.*
- 2. The period of notice mentioned above at point no. 1 shall start after the issuance of appointment letter for the new post of Principal or Assistant Professor, as the case may be and intimation regarding notice shall be sent to the Director, Higher Education, Haryana immediately by registered post.”*

5. He further submits the Enquiry Officer i.e. Principal, Government College, Sector-1, Panchkula submitted his report dated

**CWP-19791-2024**

-4-

23.05.2022 and gave an issue wise finding on various aspects. As per the said Enquiry Report, the Director General, Higher Education was called upon to look into the discrepancy on the part of respondent No.5 while joining as Principal. He made a reference to certain communication from the office of Director General, Higher Education about proposing to look into the complaint and to take action on the enquiry report that had been submitted.

6. The Registrar Lokayukta, Haryana submitted a report dated 19.04.2023 wherein a recommendation was made that the respondent No. 5 is required to resign from her previous post before joining as a Principal and deposit her salary of one month but the same was not done. The Lokayukta, Haryana, however, dismissed the complaint filed by the petitioner vide order dated 23.11.2023 which is now a subject matter of challenge in the present writ petition.

7. Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the Lokayukta, Haryana failed to appreciate that an enquiry had been conducted by the Principal of the Government P. G. College, Sector-1, Panchkula about various discrepancies in appointment that were a subject matter of enquiry and that such discrepancies were also reported by the Registrar, Lokayukta, Haryana after conducting a preliminary enquiry into the complaint. He contends that notwithstanding the said reports submitted by these two Enquiry Officers against the discrepancies in the process of selection and appointment of respondent No.5 in the college, the complaint in question has been dismissed. The non-compliance of statutory procedure rendered



respondent No.5, liable for action against her.

8. Counsel for the petitioner was confronted with the fact that the appointment of the respondent No. 5 as Principal of S.A. Jain (PG) College, Ambala City, Haryana was challenged by the son of the petitioner by way of CWP-22587 of 2021 dismissed by the Single Bench of this Court, he fairly concedes that even though the said fact has not been specifically mentioned in the present writ petition, however, the dismissal of the writ petition filed by the son of the petitioner is not an impediment in the present case. He, however, contends that Letters Patent Appeal against the said judgment is still pending. He also fairly concedes that the petitioner has a personal grievance against respondent No.5 since son of the petitioner was earlier working with the S.A. Jain (PG) College, Ambala City and that respondent No.5 had taken action against the son of the petitioner, hence the petitioner is pursuing the present case even though he has no prejudice so far as appointment as Principal is concerned.

9. In the aforesaid background, it is essential to advert to the order dated 23.11.2023 passed by the Lokayukta, Haryana before proceeding further in the matter, the Lokayukta has followed a detailed procedure before dismissing the complaint. Perusal of the said order reflects that on receipt of the complaint submitted by the petitioner, the Lokayukta, Haryana sent a copy of the said complaint to the Director General, Higher Education, Haryana for enquiry and submit a report vide its order dated 05.01.2022. Accordingly, an Enquiry Report dated 03.03.2022 was submitted by the Director General Higher Education which was supplied to the parties and to

**CWP-19791-2024**

-6-

which objections were filed by the petitioner herein. It was also noticed that on similar allegations, a complaint was earlier made by Vikas Verma, resident of Ambala to the Director General, Higher Education, Haryana. Accordingly, the Director General Higher Education had appointed the Principal Government College for Women, Ambala City as an Enquiry Officer and report in this regard was submitted by her on 03.05.2021. The present complainant had also made number of complaints on similar allegations before the Director General, Higher Education where he challenged the selection of respondent No. 5. The same were also looked into by the said Enquiry Officer and the conclusions submitted by her on all those complaints is extracted as under:-

“The Principal Dr. Abha Bansal was appointed as Lecturer in this College on 24th August, 1994 with the same right of Minority Institution regarding college being minority institute the judgements of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court dated 15.11.1983 (CWP No. 881 of 1980 and dated 1.2.2011 in LPA No. 362 of 1984 have been cited. There is opinion of Legal Remembrancer also regarding minority status to the institute of Principal Secretary Higher Education Department, Govt. Of Haryana in the letter dated 18.11.2020 while deciding the representation of Shri Kamal Kumar.

In view of the above court pronouncements and observations of senior officers of the undersigned as enquiry officer is not competent to adjudicate in the matter.

Dr. Abha Bansal had been appointed as Principal by the Selection Committee constituted by the Managing Committee of the College and her appointment had been approved by the Director General Higher Education, Haryana, Panchula (if



candidate fulfils all the educational qualification as prescribed by the Government). Regarding the period of lien the legal opinion may be sought from the office of Legal Remberancer/ Advocate General, Haryana.

The report is submitted for information and further necessary action please.

10. It was thus reported by the Enquiry Officer that the respondent No.5 had been appointed as Principal by the Selection Committee constituted by the Managing Committee of the College and her appointment had been approved by the Director General, Higher Education, Haryana and the candidate also fulfilled the requisite educational and experience qualifications prescribed by the Government. With respect to the complaint pertaining to the period of lien, a legal opinion was called for from the office of the Legal Remembrancer/Advocate General.

11. The complainant had also alleged that the respondent-College is not a minority institution, which has been referred by the Deputy Director in his communication dated 27.09.2022. The report, however, specifically mentioned that the respondent No.4 college had been granted a minority status by the Committee of the Kurukshetra University vide letter No. CBR 2012/0548 dated 30.05.2012.

12. As regards the appointment of respondent No. 5 as the Principal, the response specifically filed was to the effect that the said respondent had been working as Associate Professor of the College and was called for the interview in the same very college and by the same management. Her lien was retained on her post as is clearly mentioned in the



letter of appointment. Proper procedure and criteria, as laid down by the office of Director General, Haryana Education has been followed as far as appointment is concerned. The same procedure was adopted even for selecting the earlier Principals who were teaching in the same college. Further, it was also noticed by the Lokayukta, Haryana that all the documents, pleadings and other evidence was considered by the Registrar of Lokayukta, Haryana in his preliminary enquiry report dated 19.04.2023 was submitted, the relevant extract thereof reads thus:-

“4. After going through the allegations of the complainant made in the complaint and on perusal of the Inquiry Report (Mark A), Objections (Mark B), Para-wise Reply (Mark C), Written Submissions (Mark D), Response (Mark E) and Status Report (Mark F), it is amply clear that the complainant has alleged that the respondent was appointed illegally by the Management Committee of S.A. Jain College, Ambala City in violation of the instructions of the Government without joining any nominee from the Government, Director, Higher Education or the University by ignoring the meritorious candidates; and that the respondent joined as Principal without resigning from her previous post of Assistant Professor in the college and also without depositing the salary in lieu of the notice period; and that the Director, Higher Education did not initiate any action, despite several complaints. In the Inquiry Report (Mark A), it is reported that the contents of the complaint of the complainant have already been dealt with in inquiry of complaint made by Sh. Vikas Verma, which was conducted by the Principal, Government College for Women, Ambala City. It is also reported that Smt. Abha Bansal has been appointed as Principal by the selection committee constituted



by the Management Committee of the College and the appointment had been approved by the Director General, Higher Education Haryana, Panchkula. It is further reported that the Principal Smt. Abha Bansal was appointed as Lecturer in the year 1994 with the same right of Management Committee regarding college being minority institution as per judgment of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court dated 15.11.1983 passed in CWP No.581 of 1980 and the said order has been affirmed by the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana in LPA No.362 of 1984 decided on 01.02.2011.

5. The complainant in his Objections (Mark B) has reiterated the allegations of the complaint and refuted the findings of the Inquiry report. He has alleged that no enquiry has been conducted regarding the allegations made by him and the inquiry report of the Inquiry Officer conducted on an old complaint has been submitted by the department. He has also claimed that on his complaint on the CM Window, the office of Director General, Higher Education has appointed the Principal of Government College, Sector-1, Panchkula as the Inquiry Officer. In the Para- wise Reply (Mark C), the allegations of the complainant have been refuted and the findings of the inquiry report have been reiterated. It is stated that the complainant had made 5 complaints on the CM Window and as such all the complaints have been referred to the Principal, Government College, Sector-1, Panchkula for enquiry vide order dated 11.04.2022 and the inquiry report of the same dated 23.05.2022 has already been received. It is also stated that vide letter dated 25.07.2022, S.A. Jain College, Ambala City has been given the status of minority institution sine 15.11.1983. The complainant in his Written Submissions (Mark D) has contended that despite findings against the



respondent-Principal by the Inquiry Officer in the inquiry report, no action has been initiated against the respondent. In Response (Mark E), it is stated that vide letter dated 10.11.2022, the respondent was directed to deposit one month salary and thereafter also the management of the concerned college has been directed to deposit one month salary upto 31.01.2023 vide letter dated 06.01.2023. As per Status Report (Mark F), on the basis of the inquiry report dated 23.05.2023 submitted by Principal, Government College, Sector-1, Panchkula, the complaint of the complainant has already been filed on the CM Window, while the matter regarding the inquiry report dated 03.05.2021 is still under consideration with College to branch of the department. It is also stated that vide letter dated 15.09.2022, all the Principals/Presidents of the Government aided private colleges have been directed to act in accordance with the letter dated 12.01.2022 vide which it has been mandatory to deposit one month's pay or one month's notice at the time of resignation before joining on the new post, irrespective of the fact that the joining is to be made in the same college, same management committee or others.

6. It is clearly evident from the Inquiry Report (Mark A) that the allegations of the complainant that the respondent- Principal was not appointed on merits or by ignoring the instructions of the Government were not proved as the respondent was selected by the selection committee constituted by the management committee of the college, which has been declared minority institution w.e.f. 15.11.1983 on the basis of the judgments passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana. It is also clear that the Director, Higher Education Haryana, Panchkula vide letter dated 12.01.2022 has observed that as per Haryana Affiliated colleges (Security of Service) Rules, 2006, it has been made mandatory to deposit one month's pay



or one month's notice at the time of resignation before joining on the new post, irrespective of the fact that the joining is to be made in the same college, same management committee or others and as such the Principals/Presidents of the Management bodies of all the Government aided colleges have been directed to comply with the said instructions. It is further clear that the respondent had not deposited the salary in lieu of the notice period before joining on the present post of Principal. Therefore, the grievance of the complainant that the respondent has not deposited the notice pay of one month needs to be addressed by the Director, Higher Education, Haryana, Panchkula by initiating appropriate action in this regard. Thus, although prima facie, there exists no reasonable ground for conducting further enquiry or investigation in this matter, yet the action taken report regarding the deposit of the salary in lieu of notice period, by the respondent is imperative in this matter."

13. The copy of the said preliminary report was duly furnished to the petitioner and parties were also heard before the order was passed. Upon consideration of the rival contentions, the Lokayukta, Haryana dismissed the complaint filed by the petitioner by holding as under:-

"The allegation of the present complainant that College is not a minority institution cannot be accepted as there is already legal opinion of LR that the College was a minority institution and hence it does not require the nominee of Director, Higher Education. Of course approval is necessary which has already been granted by the department.

The complainant was confronted time and again to satisfy this Authority as to how the present complaint can be filed at such a belated stage when selection was made in the 2016 and



complaint was registered in the year 2022. He has tried to persuade this Authority that he was pressing his remedy by filing various complaints before different concerned authorities, but his grievances were not considered by any such authorities, hence he filed the present complaint at the earliest possible time.

This arguments of the complainant cannot be accepted, as no satisfactory explanation has come forward from the complainant which may justify the inordinate delay in filing the present complaint.

Similarly, Letter dated 12.1.2022 is not straightway attracted in the case in hand, for the reason that Dr. Abha Bansal had joined as Principal in the S.A. Jain College, Ambala City on 1.6.2016 whereas the issue regarding deposit of three months or one month salary in lieu of notice period can only be considered as per the prevailing instructions which were in existence as on 1.1.2016. Complainant has failed to produce relevant instructions which specifically provides such condition of deposit of salary. Therefore, in the absence of such instructions, this Authority cannot hold that respondent Principal was liable to pay salary of three months' or one month in lieu of notice. However, the Department of Higher Education is already at liberty to act in the matter as per the relevant instructions in the matter.

Moreover, as per the information sent by the State Public Information Officer, Director General of Higher Education, Haryana dated 09.02.2022 addressed to the present complainant, whereby the noting dated 12.12.2022 has been supplied to the complainant, the matter is under consideration with the Government.

In the background of the case, when the present complaint has been filed by the complainant in order to settle



his personal score as Shri Kamal Sharma, who is son of the complainant, was dismissed from the service during probation period, this Authority is of the considered view that the present complaint has been filed with this motive in mind.

Furthermore, son of the present complainant, has also tested the selection of Dr. Abha Bansal by challenging her selection/ appointment as Principal, S.A. Jain College, Ambala, by way of C.W.P. No. 22587/2021, which was dismissed by Hon'ble High Court, though as per the present complainant, LPA against the Hon'ble High Court judgment is now pending before the Hon'ble High Court.

For the fore-going discussion, this Authority does not find any reason, to interfere in the matter and therefore, the present complaint is hereby closed.

All concerned be informed accordingly.

14. The learned Lokayukta, Haryana dismissed the complaint on the following grounds:

- i) The application of the complainant was submitted at a highly belated stage. The selection in dispute was made in the year 2016 and the complaint was filed in the year 2022.
- ii) The aspect as to the mandate of depositing the 03 months or 01 month salary in lieu of the notice period was also considered. It was specifically noticed that the said mandate has to be seen in light of the prevailing instructions as on 01.06.2016. No instructions in this regard had been placed before the Lokayukta. There is only a reference to the letter of 2022 as per which 01 month pay in lieu of the notice period was required to



be deposited. Since the selection pertains to the year 2016, hence, the instructions/clarification dated 12.01.2022 become operational prospectively and cannot apply with respect to the selections made earlier in point of time. Moreover, it was an issue on which the Director General was required to take appropriate steps. Such a liberty had already been extended.

- iii) It was noticed that the complaint had been filed by the complainant (petitioner) to set his personal score as his son Kamal Sharma was dismissed from service during probation period. Kamal Sharma had also challenged the selection of the respondent No.5 as Principal of the S.A. Jain (PG) College, Ambala City in CWP-22587 of 2021 which was dismissed.

15. An arduous attempt has been made by the learned Counsel for the petitioner to contend that there was no semblance of propriety in the procedure of appointment and that the respondent No.5 did not deposit the salary in lieu of one month mandatory notice, however, I fail to find myself in agreement with the contention of the learned Counsel for the petitioner for the following reason:-

- i) That the provisions under the Haryana Lokayukta, Act, 2002 empower the Lokayukta to conduct an enquiry into the grievances/allegations against the public servants. An allegation under Section 2 (b) of the Haryana Lokayukta Act, 2002 deals with a public



servant intentionally or knowingly abusing his position so as to obtain any undue gain or favour to himself or herself or to cause loss to any other person or where such an act is actuated by corrupt motives or there is an allegation of corruption. The fourth aspect in which an allegation can be enquired into by the Lokayukta is when a public servant is in possession of the pecuniary resources or property disproportionate to his known sources of income. The definition as provided under the Act, 2002 is extracted as under:-

Definitions

2. *In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,-*

Xx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xx

(b) “allegation” in relation to a public servant means any affirmation that such public servant-

(i) has knowingly and intentionally abused his position as such to obtain any undue gain or favour to himself or to any other person or to cause undue hardship or harm to any other person;

(ii) was actuated in the discharge of his functions as such public servant by personal interest, or improper or corrupt motives;

(iii) is guilty of corruption, lack of integrity in his capacity as such public servant; or

(iv) is in possession of pecuniary resources or property disproportionate to his known source of income and such pecuniary resources or property held by the public servant personally or by any member of his family



or by some other persons on his behalf;

Xx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

(f) “corruption” includes any act punishable under chapter IX of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 or the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, or under any law for the time being in force for prevention of corruption;

Xx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

(h) “grievance” means the claim by a person that a right to which he is entitled to is denied to him or is unreasonably delayed by the act of omission or commission of a public servant or the act complained of amounts to mal-administration;

16. Grievance on the other hand is in relation to a right of a person to which he is entitled that has been denied to him by an act of Omission or Commission of a public servant. Invariably, the complaint in the present nature cannot be termed as a grievance since there was no right that had accrued in favour of the petitioner and had been actually denied.

17. The nature of complaint can only at best be regarded as a complaint as would fall within the definition of an “allegation” as prescribed under Section 2 (b) of the Haryana Lokayukta Act, 2002.

18. Even if the best case of the petitioner is taken into consideration, the allegations *ex facie* do not make out the ingredients of allegation as prescribed therein. There is no evidence that has been adduced by the petitioner that prior to issuance of instructions in the year 2022 by the Director General, Higher Education, there was any requirement of depositing any salary in lieu of having accepted the appointment. The said



letter prescribed for the salary of one month in lieu of the notice period to be deposited by the Principals before joining a new post. The selection in the present case was done on 01.06.2016 and the instructions that were in force i.e. at the time of selection of respondent No.5 as the Principal of the respondent No.4-College have not been brought on record. A perusal of the letter of 2022 is moreover suggestive that 03 months' salary in lieu of the notice period was to be deposited only when the person joins some other institution and not when he/she joins the same institution. The requirement of depositing one month salary was introduced for the first time if the person joins the same institution despite the aforesaid defect having been cited by the Lokayukta, the petitioner did not place any instruction on record as were in force in the year 2016 when selection was made to canvass his argument. Failure to controvert the finding recorded by the Lokayukta without any cogent evidence to rebut the conclusion, re-affirms that the finding does not suffer from any error of law or fact.

19. Be that as it may, the same can at best be an irregularity and cannot be said to be an illegitimate gain having been drawn by the respondent No.5.

20. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of *State of Karnataka v. M.L. Kesari, (2010) 9 SCC 247* laid down the conditions to test when an appointment would be considered illegal and when it would be considered irregular. The relevant part of the judgment is extracted hereunder:



“7. It is evident from the above that there is an exception to the general principles against “regularisation” enunciated in *Umadevi (3)* [(2006) 4 SCC 1] , if the following conditions are fulfilled:

(i) The employee concerned should have worked for 10 years or more in duly sanctioned post without the benefit or protection of the interim order of any court or tribunal. In other words, the State Government or its instrumentality should have employed the employee and continued him in service voluntarily and continuously for more than ten years.

(ii) The appointment of such employee should not be illegal, even if irregular. Where the appointments are not made or continued against sanctioned posts or where the persons appointed do not possess the prescribed minimum qualifications, the appointments will be considered to be illegal. But where the person employed possessed the prescribed qualifications and was working against sanctioned posts, but had been selected without undergoing the process of open competitive selection, such appointments are considered to be irregular.

21. A mere irregularity if any, on part of respondent No.5 cannot be deemed as a proof of violation of law. Besides, any administrative lapse *ipso facto* cannot be said to be preceded by a corrupt motive or signify



CWP-19791-2024

-19-

commission of corruption. The element of malice and malefic intent is essential for proving the intentional abuse of the position. There is nothing on record to show that there was an intentional or malefic abuse of the position by respondent No.5 in securing an appointment for herself. The process of selection was undertaken by the Committee nominated by respondent No.4 –S.A. Jain (PG) College, Ambala City and that after following the due process of law, respondent No.5 was selected. The selection had also been approved by the Director General, Higher Education, Haryana and there was no illegality or procedural impropriety noticed by the Director General, Higher Education.

22. Under the given circumstances, I also find myself in agreement with the reason recorded by the Lokayukta that the present complaint was actuated by malice on account of the fact that respondent No.5 had initiated action against Kamal Sharma-son of the petitioner, whose services were terminated during the period of probation. Besides, the son of the petitioner had already challenged the appointment/selection of respondent No.5 to the post of Principal of the S.A. Jain (PG) College and having unsuccessfully attempted disparagement of the selection of the petitioner, the present writ petition has been filed to perpetuate further harassment on respondent No. 5. I find that the institution of the present complaint as well as the writ petition is an example of abuse of the process of law.

23. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***Subrata Roy Sahara Vs. Union of India***, reported as ***(2014) 8 SCC 470***. The relevant extract thereof reads thus:-



“191. The Indian judicial system is grossly afflicted, with frivolous litigation. Ways and means need to be evolved, to deter litigants from their compulsive obsession, towards senseless and ill-considered claims. One needs to keep in mind, that in the process of litigation, there is an innocent sufferer on the other side, of every irresponsible and senseless claim. He suffers long drawn anxious periods of nervousness and restlessness, whilst the litigation is pending, without any fault on his part. He pays for the litigation, from out of his savings (or out of his borrowings), worrying that the other side may trick him into defeat, for no fault of his. He spends invaluable time briefing counsel and preparing them for his claim. Time which he should have spent at work, or with his family, is lost, for no fault of his. Should a litigant not be compensated for, what he has lost, for no fault? The suggestion to the legislature is, that a litigant who has succeeded, must be compensated by the one, who has lost. The suggestion to the legislature is to formulate a mechanism, that anyone who initiates and continues a litigation senselessly, pays for the same. It is suggested that the legislature should consider the introduction of a “Code of Compulsory Costs”.

24. The present **writ petition is accordingly dismissed with a cost of Rs. 50,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the District Legal Services Authority, Ambala** within a period of one month of the receipt of certified copy of this order.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2024

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No