



consent letter of the employee, who gave consent to teach in the petitioner’s absence by signing in column 17 of CCL application form, had not been attached.

3. Apparently, both the objections are not sustainable. In case the application has been received late in the office, the petitioner cannot be blamed for that since she submitted it through proper channel to the School Principal, and it was to be sent to the Block Education officer by the Principal only. Non-submission of a consent letter by the concerned employee can also not be blamed on the petitioner, as it was for the Principal to get the consent letter, if required.

4. Faced with the situation, learned State counsel contends that appropriate decision on the petitioner’s application will be taken within two weeks.

5. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.

6. Ordered accordingly.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

26.11.2024
Payal

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>