



LPA-214-2017 (O&M)

1

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

(208)

LPA-214-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 25.07.2025

Dr. (Mrs.) Urmil Rani

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: None for the appellant.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate for
Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. R.K. Malik, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Varun Veer Chauhan, Advocate for respondent No.4.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. This Court, vide order dated 04.02.2025, had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant appeal :-

"It is stated that the appellant expired on 09.04.2019. Till she expired, she was working in the college where she was appointed initially as Lecturer on permanent basis in Hindi department in the grade of 2200-4000. Her appointment was treated as irregular by the Committee who again advertised the post on the premise that at the time of selection, the representation of the Government was not proper.

Resultantly, the deceased appellant was asked to appear again for interview which she challenged before this Court, and an interim order was passed by this Court restraining the respondents from terminating her services. She continued to perform her duties till the judgment dated



20.01.2017 was passed by the learned Single Judge holding her appointment to be contrary to law. The said judgment passed by the Single Judge was challenged in LPA, and an interim order was passed by this Court on 11.07.2017 staying the operation of the order passed by the Single Judge.

In the circumstances, the only issue required to be examined by this Court is whether any consequential relief is to be given to the LR's relating to the death of the deceased writ petitioner.

The learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.4/Management would apprise this Court by getting an affidavit from the Management as to whether the regular salary was being paid to the writ petitioner, and whether the salary was being reimbursed by the State authorities for the intervening period.

Let the matter come up again on 10.03.2025."

2. Pursuant to the order (supra), an affidavit has been filed by the learned counsel for the respondent No.4, stating therein, that no further grievance survives in the instant appeal.
3. Despite the above statement made by learned counsel for the respondent No.4, no one has caused appearance on behalf of the appellant, today in the Court.
4. Consequently, the instant appeal is **dismissed for want of prosecution.**
5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

July 25, 2025
Manpreet

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