

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

110

2025:PHHC:030954



CWP-33080-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.03.2025.

ANAMIKA MALIK

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT: Mr. Sourabh Kandoi, Advocate, for
Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J (ORAL)

Prayer made in the present petition was for directing the respondent Department to consider and decide the application, recommendation as well as letter dated 07.02.2024 (Annexures P-8 to P-10).

2 Despite the matter being adjourned on three occasions to enable the counsel for petitioner to complete instructions and also to refer to the provisions under which the services of the petitioner may be transferred from Punhana, District Nuh to District Palwal, neither arguments have been advanced nor any instructions have been placed on record.

3 As matter of fact, counsel for the petitioner has been seeking adjournments since the question has been posed to him. Today again, the same very request for adjournment is being made which is not considered justified.

2025:PHHC:030954



4 It seems that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the present writ petition. The same is accordingly dismissed for non-prosecution.

March 05, 2025.	(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
raj arora	JUDGE
<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>: Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>: Yes/No</i>