

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

Date of decision: 01.07.2026

...Petitioner

...Respondents

Mr. Harish Nain, DAG, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner became eligible under the 1998 Rules, as such, 2012 Rules cannot be retrospectively applied to the petitioner to her disadvantage. Further, similarly

**CWP-19036-2026****-2-**

situated persons have been granted relaxations but the petitioner has been denied the same relief. Further, under Rule 17, the respondents have power to relax the conditions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that she would be satisfied if the representation (Annexure P-9) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned State counsel, appearing on advanced notice, submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation (Annexure P-9) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording her an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.2.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

01.07.2026*Neha*

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