



118

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

RA-CW-499-2025 in
CWP-30509-2025
Date of decision: 18.11.2025

Sarita Kumari Tobadiya @ Sarita Singhal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Himanshu Bansal, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Additional A.G., Haryana.

Mr. R.K. Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Parmar, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present review application has been filed under Section 114(b) read with Order 47 and Section 151 of CPC seeking review by way of modification of the order dated 15.10.2025 passed in CWP No.30509 of 2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contend that a typographical error has crept in the order dated 15.10.2025 passed by this Court. Respondent No.2 is the recruitment agency which has to prepare a fresh selected list in terms of the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.16904 of 2021 titled as 'Neeraj Vs. State of Haryana and another' along with twelve bunch of cases decided on 22.05.2025 (Annexure A-2). Further, in the fourth paragraph of the order dated 15.10.2025, a direction was issued to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of the



**RA-CW-499-2025 in
CWP-30509-2025**

-2-

judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.3303 of 2015 decided on 01.02.2022 titled as 'Union of India Vs.Pankaj Kumar Srivastava and another' rather the case of the petitioner is required to be decided in terms of the Division Bench judgment in ***Neeraj's case (supra)***.

3. Learned State counsel as well as counsel for respondent No.3 submits that they have no objection in case the present review application is allowed.

4. In view of the discussion above, the review application is allowed. Typographical error crept in the order dated 15.10.2025 stands corrected and para Nos.3 & 4 of the order dated 15.10.2025 is modified to the extent that the main petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents/competent authority to consider the case of the petitioner in case her name is recommended in the fresh selected list prepared by respondent No.2 instead of respondent No.3 and her case shall be considered in terms of the judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court in ***Neeraj's case (supra)***. Needful be done within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

18.11.2025
Neha

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