



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

212

CWP-23300-2017

Date of Decision: 08.09.2025

REENA AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Sunil Kumar Nehra, Advocate with
Mr. Anuj Chauhan, Advocate and Mr. Rahil Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Sahni, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to allow the petitioners to continue in service as Extension Lecturers till regularly selected candidates join service. In terms of interim order dated 10.10.2017, initially all the petitioners were allowed to continue in service. However, as per short reply filed on behalf of the third respondent/Principal, Government College for Women, Badhra, petitioner no.1 absented from duty without intimation with effect from 24.11.2017, and only petitioners no.2 and 3 continued working there.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, however, contends that petitioner no.3 was also removed from service later, and she approached this Court by filing CWP-24097-2021, which was disposed of vide order dated 28.07.2022, directing the respondents to consider her representation. And she is not in service. He also contends that during pendency of the petition, the respondents have notified a new Policy for engagement and continuance of Extension Lecturers. Accordingly, the petitioners may be permitted to



withdraw the present petition with liberty to petitioner no.2 to make a representation to the respondents to consider her case for adjustment/continuance in service in terms thereof. The representation may be ordered to be decided within a specified period.

3. Learned State counsel submits that in case any such representation is filed within two weeks, the same will be decided by the second respondent/Director, Higher Education, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law.

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

5. Ordered accordingly. Petitioner no.2 is already continuing in service as per the short reply filed on behalf of respondents, but she will be allowed to remain in service only in terms of decision on her representation considering her entitlement as per the latest Policy. In case the representation is not filed within two weeks from today, her services will be dispensed with.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

08.09.2025
Ad

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