



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.: 104

Civil Writ Petition No.15476 of 1998 (O & M)

Date of Decision: January 15, 2025

Sudhir Kumar

..... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

State of Haryana & another

..... RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

PRESENT: - None for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

Tribhuvan Dahiya, J (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to grant the benefit of service for the break period rendered by the petitioner during *ad hoc* appointment.

2. Learned State counsel, on instructions, received from the second respondent vide memo dated 14.01.2025, contends that vide Finance Department letter dated 02.07.2002, the Government decided not to give salary for the break period to lecturers during the *ad hoc* service. It was further decided vide Finance Department Instructions dated 26.08.2002, that the period of break in service with respect to *ad hoc* service prior to 1982 was to be treated as Extraordinary Leave (EOL) without pay. In terms therewith, vide letter dated 18.04.2002, the petitioner's break period from 01.04.1982 to 02.05.1982 and 11.07.1982 to 10.11.1982 has already been treated as EOL without pay.

3. These facts have not been disputed by the petitioner, nor have the letters/instructions, referred to above, been challenged by him.



CWP No.15476 of 1998

[2]

4. The petition, accordingly, stands disposed of as the permissible benefit in terms of the applicable instructions has already been given to the petitioner.

5. Since the main petition stands decided, pending application(s), if any, is/are disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(Tribhuvan Dahiya)
Judge

January 15, 2025
avin

Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/ No
Yes/ No