



CWP-12696-2026

-1-

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

131

CWP-12696-2026

Date of Decision: 27.04.2026

Renu

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Ms. Santosh Miglani, Advocate for the petitioner
(through Video Conferencing)

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the speaking order dated 25.08.2025, Annexure P-7. Further, a writ of *mandamus* has been sought directing the respondents to grant remuneration to the petitioner at the rate of ₹57,700, as is being paid to other contractual Assistant Professors working in the Department.

2. Learned State counsel contended that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing CWP-10266-2025, for release of pending salary and grant of remuneration at the rate of ₹57,700, which was disposed of vide order dated 08.04.2025, directing respondent no.2/Director General, Higher Education, to decide her pending representation in this regard. The same has been considered and decided vide impugned order dated 25.08.2025. The details of salary paid to the petitioner for the period there was actual workload in the College and she took



classes, have been given in the order. She has not been paid only for the period of no work/zero workload, for which she is not entitled in terms of the policy. And as of now, she is being paid full remuneration against the workload. The relevant part of the order reads as under:

Whereas, for faithful compliance of above directions of the Hon'ble Court, the representation dated 13.9.2023 (Annexure P-6) has been examined by the undersigned in light of relevant instructions as well as relevant record provided by the Principal concerned, i.e. Government College Jind, and the petitioner in her representation dated 13.9.2023 (Annexure P-6) has claimed for salary for the following period only:-

- i) 01 January 2021 to 22 June 2021.
- ii) 01 August to 31 October 2021 and;
- iii) 01 October 2022 to 31 December 2022;

Whereas, as per records made available by the Principal concerned, the details of the period for which the admissible salary had already been paid to the petitioner, was observed to be as under:-

Sr. No.	Salary Period (as claimed by Ms. Renu in application dated 21.09.2023)	Paid for the following period	Unpaid for the following period (due to zero workload)
1.	01.01.2021 to 22.06.2021	1. January 2021 (Paid on 01.10.2021) 2. June 2021 (for 12 days Paid on 06.07.2021)	February to May 2021 and June 2021 (10 Days)
2.	01.08.2021 to 31.10.2021	October 2021 (Paid on 10.11.2021)	August and September 2021
3.	01.10.2022 to 31.12.2022	October, November and December 20 days (Paid in the form of arrears as per sanction letter no.2151-53 dated 09.10.2023) of Rs.1,04,429/-	

(The receipt of the above as provided by the concerned Principal is attached along).

Whereas, upon examination of the details, it is amply clear that the petitioner, in her representation dated 13.9.2023 has wrongly contended that salary for the period 01 January 2021 to 22 June 2021, 01 August to 31 October 2021 and 01 October 2022 to 31 December 2022, has not been released/paid and rather the same has already been paid to her; Further as mentioned in the above table that the salary

**CWP-12696-2026****-3-**

for the period from February to May 2021 and June 2021 (10 Days), August and September 2021 and the remaining days in the month of December 2022 cannot be paid on account of zero workload and liable to be displaced/relieved by the competent authority, i.e Principal concerned though she remained continue in service; ...

3. The facts aforementioned are not in dispute. Consequently, this Court finds no ground to entertain the petition, and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

27.04.2026*Payal*

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No