



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124

CWP-2614-2026

Date of Decision: 05.02.2026

POONAM DEVI

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Pulkit Dagar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Sahni, Additional Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Harmanjit Singh Johal, Advocate.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order dated 24.11.2025, Annexure P-2, passed by the third respondent, whereby the petitioner's application for Child Care Leave (CCL) has been rejected, with liberty to apply afresh after 31.03.2026.

2. On the last date of hearing, 31.01.2026, the following submissions were made by learned counsel for the petitioner:

It is, *inter alia*, contended that the petitioner's application for Child Care Leave (CCL), dated 14.11.2025, Annexure P-1, was duly forwarded for approval by the School Principal. It mentioned that alternate arrangements for teaching work in her absence was in place as three teachers had undertaken to share her workload. However, the application has not been considered by recording that "*keeping in view the study of students the matter of CCL be forwarded after 31.03.2026*", as apparent from the communication dated 14.11.2025, Annexure P-2. This is



arbitrary and unreasonable as the petitioner's daughter is studying in 12th standard and her exams are scheduled to commence on 17.02.2026. Also, she would be eighteen years old by 31.03.2026, and the petitioner would not be entitled to claim the CCL thereafter.

3. Learned State counsel has received instructions from the third respondent/District Education Officer, vide memo dated 05.02.2026, which is retained on the case file as Annexure 'A'. Referring to the same, he contends that the petitioner has already been granted sixty days' CCL from 04.07.2025 to 01.09.2025, and it was not considered appropriate to permit her to proceed on leave again, keeping in view the academic session, examination and teaching schedule. He has referred to the following paragraphs of the instructions in this regard:

1 to 4 xxx xxx xxx

5. That it is evident from the above table that the petitioner has already availed the 60 days CCL from 04.07.2025 to 01.09.2025 in the current session of 2025-2026 and she again applied CCL from 08.12.2025 to 30.05.2026 (174 days). It is pertinent to mention here that total no. of 423 students are studying the Hindi Subject from classes 9th to 12th in this school and in the same session, if another 100 days CCL had been permitted, it would hamper the progress of academic session, examination and teaching schedule, and the requirement of ensuring uninterrupted academic functioning in a Government Model Sanskriti Senior Secondary School. The answering-respondent communicated vide dated 24.11.2025 Annexure (P-2) was not a rejection, but an administrative intimation advising that the application be presented after 31.03.2026, keeping in view the academic session examination and teaching schedule, and the requirement of ensuring uninterrupted academic functioning in a Government Senior Secondary School.

It is worthwhile to mention here that the petition suffers from misreading of instructions, as no rule mandates that CCL must be sanctioned merely because the child is appearing in an examination. The rule only enables consideration, not automatic approval.

6. xxx xxx xxx

7. It is submitted that while the daughter of the petitioner is stated to be born on 25.07.2008, mere proximity to majority does not override administrative discretion. The Child Care Leave is not an examination leave and cannot be equated with it.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to dispute that the petitioner’s minor child was born on 25.07.2008, and would not attain majority by 31.03.2026. He, however, contended that due to inadvertence an incorrect statement was made by him in this regard.

5. The facts aforementioned have been duly considered.

6. The Department has provided a reasonable justification for not granting CCL to the petitioner at this stage. It is also apparent on record that the petitioner has wrongly stated her daughter’s age in para 3 of the petition. Further, the petitioner’s application for CCL has not been rejected altogether, and she has been permitted to apply afresh after 31.03.2026.

7. In view thereof, this Court finds nothing wrong with the impugned order and the petition stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

05.02.2026
Ad

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