



235

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

CWP-10416-2019

Date of decision: 04.11.2025

Bimla Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Nischal Chetanya Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kumar Singla, Asstt.A.G., Haryana.

Ms. Nikita Goel, Advocate for
Mr. Prateek Mahajan, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing of the impugned order dated 15.03.2013 (Annexure P-32) passed by respondent No.3.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the husband of the petitioner died in harness and pursuant thereto, she had applied for a job on compassionate grounds. However, application of the petitioner was declined on the ground that at the relevant time, her husband was not in regular employment. Further the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the judgment rendered by this Court in **CWP-6154-2020**, titled as ***Dr. Hardeep Lal Joshi and others vs Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and others***, decided on **01.07.2025**.



CWP-10416-2019

-2-

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.4, submit that Employees Grievance Redressal Committee has been constituted under the Haryana State Litigation Policy, 2025 and all these matters would be considered and decided by the said Committee.

4. In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied in case the issue involved in the present petition is considered and decided by Employees Grievance Redressal Committee constituted under the Haryana State Litigation Policy, 2025, in the light of the judgments rendered by this Court in CWP-2457-2025, titled as *H.C. Sharma vs State of Haryana and others*, decided on 30.07.2025 and CWP-28761-2025, titled as *Ranjit Singh vs State of Punjab and others*, decided on 25.09.2025, by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 submits that she has no objection, in case a direction is issued to the Employees Grievance Redressal Committee constituted under the Haryana State Litigation Policy, 2025, for time-bound consideration and decision of the issue involved in the present petition by passing a speaking order.

6. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the Employees Grievance Redressal Committee constituted under the Haryana State Litigation Policy, 2025 is directed to consider the issue involved in the present petition and pass a speaking order in the light of *H.C. Sharma's case (supra)* and *Ranjit Singh's case (supra)*, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 03 months from the

**CWP-10416-2019****-3-**

date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted to her forthwith.

7. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

04.11.2025*Neha*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No