



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111

CWP-13074-2024

Date of decision: 23.01.2025

DXXX

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Priyanka Sud, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant writ petition had been filed raising a challenge to the inquiry report dated 15.03.2024 (Annexure P-18) given by the Internal Complaint Committee constituted by the respondent No.2-Director, Agriculture and Farmers Welfare Department, Panchkula.

2. When the matter came up for hearing on 14.01.2025, Counsel for the petitioner was confronted with the existence of an Appellate Authority under Section 18 of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal), Act, 2013 which prescribes for statutory remedy of appeal. As the Counsel contended that



CWP-13074-2024

-2-

there is no statutory authority notified by the respondent-State, learned State Counsel was directed to seek instructions.

3. On resumed hearing, learned State Counsel has submitted that the Government of Haryana has already issued instructions vide communication bearing No. IR-3/32124-206 dated 13.09.2018 whereby any person aggrieved from the recommendations made under sub Section 2 of Section 13 or under Clause (II) of sub Section 3 of Section 13 or sub Section 1 or sub Section 2 of Section 14 or Section 17 or non implementation of the recommendations may prefer an appeal to the Appellate Authority notified under Clause (a) of Section 2 of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946.

4. In view of the above, Counsel for the petitioner does not press the instant writ petition with liberty to take recourse to the statutory remedy of appeal.

5. Disposed of as not pressed with liberty as aforesaid.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

JANUARY 23, 2025
Vishal Sharma

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