


No. 615 (DW) Writs Dated 11/12/14

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

1. The State of Haryana through the Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary, Government of Haryana, Education Department, Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.
2. The Director of Secondary Education, Haryana, Panchkula.
3. Haryana Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Panchkula.
4. The Headmaster, Shashtri Model School, Phase I, Mohali.
5. The Principal, SD Senior Secondary School, Thanesar District Kurukshetra.
6. The Principal DAV Public School, Pundri (Kaithal).



Subject: CWP No. 13464 of 1999 (O&M)

Smt. Kamla Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of orders dated **05.11.2014** passed by this Hon'ble High Court in the above noted case for immediate compliance.

Given under my hand and the seal of this Court on this 22nd day of November, 2014.

JR-BT

22/11/14
**Superintendent(Writs)
For Assistant Registrar (Writs)**

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

C.W.P.NO. 13464 of 1999.

Smt. Kamla Singh daughter of Shri Phool Singh,
resident of V P O Nangal Chaudhary, Tehsil and
District Mohindergarh.



...Petitioner.

versus

1. The State of Haryana through the Financial Commissioner cum Secretary to Govt. of Haryana, Education Department, Civil Secretariat, Sector 17, Chandigarh.
2. The Director Secondary Education, Haryana, 30 bays building, Sector 17-C, Chandigarh.
3. Haryana Public Service Commission through its Secretary, S.C.O.No. 64-65, Sector 17-A, Chandigarh.
4. Smt. Suman Devi, Senior Lecturer, D.I.E.T., Palwal, District Kurukshetra.
5. The Headmaster, Shastri Model School, Phase I, Mohali, District Ropar.
6. The Principal, S.D.Senior Secondary School, Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Wadhwa
VENDOR
Haryana High Court
CHANDIGARH

4
Subscribed and signed at Chandigarh



7. The Principal, D.A.V. Public School, Pundri (Kaithal).

...Respondents.

CIVIL WRIT PETITION UNDER Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the appointment letter dated 24-3-99 (Annexure P-3) qua Respondent No.4 as she was ineligible for selection/ appointment to the post of Principal;

a writ in the nature of Mandamus for directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner as Principal of the Government Senior Secondary School, in the State from the date when Respondent No.4 was appointed with all consequential benefits;

or

to issue any other appropriate writ, orders or directions, as this Hon'ble High Court may deem fit and proper under the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case.

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH :-

1. That the petitioner is a resident of District Mohindergarh in the State of Haryana and thus, being a citizen of India is competent to invoke the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble High Court under Articles 226/227 of

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 13464 of 1999 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.11.2014

Smt. Kamla Singh

.. Petitioner

versus

The State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr.H.N. Mehtani, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

None for respondent No.5 and 6.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

Mr. Ravi Verma, learned counsel for the petitioner, who has filed the present petition stated that the petitioner had taken no objection from him in January, 2013 for engaging Mr. Ashish Pannu, Advocate. Hence, he seeks permission to withdraw from the present petition.

Ordered accordingly.


Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the petitioner in the present case was seeking appointment to the post of Principal being in the waiting list. No one from the waiting list was appointed. It was further pointed out that the petitioner had retired from service after attaining the age of superannuation on 28.02.2010.

In view of the aforesaid facts, prima facie nothing is required to be done in the present petition. However, as none has appeared for the petitioner, the petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

05.11.2014

Kumud

Sell (Rajesh Bindal)
Judge



DW
15-11-14

DFA (ad) (ad)
10/11/14
Suo

22/11/14
Suo

ban
9-12-14