



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CWP-27341-2025

Decided On: 22.09.2025

SEEMA RANI

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sajjan Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* against the order dated 12.06.2025, Annexure P-3, whereby the petitioner has been granted Child Care Leave (CCL) from 15.07.2025 to 12.09.2025, instead of 15.07.2025 to 26.11.2025.

2. As per facts, the petitioner applied for CCL vide application dated 19.05.2025, Annexure P-2, which was forwarded to the Directorate by the College Principal vide endorsement dated 03.06.2025. A reference has been made to the undertaking by College Principal dated 19.05.2025, that in case of granting CCL her classes/work load will be adjusted against the existing staff of English Department during her leave period from 15.07.2025 to 26.11.2025. Despite the recommendation, the petitioner was granted CCL only for sixty days, i.e., upto 12.09.2025, vide office order dated 12.06.2025, Annexure P-3. The petitioner represented for extension of CCL upto



26.11.2025 which was rejected by the Directorate, vide impugned memo dated 03.09.2025, Annexure P-5, without citing any reason.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner claims that rejection is without any basis as the College Principal has already undertaken that her workload will be taken care within the Department. As per the law laid down by this Court in CWP-21506-2017 titled *Dr. Kanchan Bala v. State of Haryana and others*, the petitioner has a right to get CCL. By rejecting her request without citing any reason, the respondents acted arbitrarily and, therefore, the impugned memo dated 03.09.2025, is liable to be set aside. He has made reference to interim orders passed by this Court in different writ petitions from time to time, as appended to the petition, and prays that the interim relief should be granted to the petitioner also by directing the respondents to allow CCL for the period originally applied by her.

4. Learned State counsel could not dispute that in case the petitioner's CCL was not to be extended, the Department was required to pass a reasoned order to that effect, especially because the College Principal had already undertaken that her workload would be adjusted within the Department for the entire duration of leave. She could not refer to any document indicating that studies in the College were adversely affected due to the petitioner's absence. It is, however, contended that after expiry of the leave period, the petitioner has already rejoined on 13.09.2025.

5. In these circumstances, on instructions from Mr. Ashok Kumar, Deputy Director, learned State counsel contends that the impugned memo dated 03.09.2025 will be withdrawn, and the Department will pass a fresh order regarding granting/extending the petitioner's CCL for the remaining period, within two weeks from today. In case she is to be given extension of



CCL for the remaining period, the same will commence from the date of passing the order.

6. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.
7. Ordered accordingly.

22.09.2025
Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No