

In the Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh

CWP No. 143 07 of 2008

Suman lata-w/o Ramesh Kumar r/o village Muana Teh. Safidon Distt Jind.

Nov go

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana through Secretary Department of Education, Civil Secretariat Chandigarh.

The District Education Officer Jind Distt. Jind.

The Block Education Officer Jind Distt. Jind.

The Govt. Senior Secondary School Muana Distt Jind through its Principal.

Smt. Kamal w/o Inderjit Guest Teacher Govt. Senior Secondary School Muana Distt. Jind.

Respondents

Civil Writ petition under article 226,227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 20.4.2007 passed by the respondent no. 3 Ann. P-4 and further for issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents no. 2 to 4 to appoint the petitioner as guest Teacher in the respondent no.4 School.

AND/OR

For issuance of any other appropriate writ order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case.

Respectfully Showeth: -

1. That the petitioner is the resident of village Muana Teh. Safidon Distt. Jind. The petitioner is a resident of/Haryana. The petitioner is a citizen of India. Therefore the petitioners are entitled/to invoke the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble

Court under Article 226,227 of the Constitution of India.

SPECIAL Pb. & Hry. his Chandigarh.

Civil Writ Petition No. 19307 of 2008

Suman

Versus

State of Haryana and others

Present:

Mr. U.K. Agnihotri, Advocate

for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr.DAG, Haryana

for the State.

Mr. J.B. Sharma, Advocate

for respondent No.5.

The petitioner had challenged the appointment of respondent No.5, who was appointed as Guest teacher. Now regular appointment has been made and accordingly respondent No.5 has been relieved. Counsel for the petitioner says that the relief claimed in the writ petition is rendered infructuous. He, however, further prays that as and when Guest teacher is to be appointed in future, the petitioner's claim may also be considered. This goes without saying that the claim of the other eligible person is required to be considered while making appointment.

In view of this, the present writ petition is rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

September 23, 2009 rts

SA - (RANJIT SINGH)

DFA added

35/9/08 25/9/08 Mont 12/10/01

Examina