



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

LPA-712-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.02.2025

State of Punjab and others Appellant(s)
Vs.
Shashi Bala Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. R.S. Pandher, Senior DAG, Punjab
for the appellant.

LISA GILL, J.

1. Prayer in this appeal is for setting aside impugned order dated 31.03.2017, whereby petition filed by respondent-writ petitioner was disposed of alongwith a bunch of 12 other writ petitions. Question involved for consideration in the writ petitions was whether a lady entitled to benefit of reservation in a particular State prior to her marriage would be entitled to benefit of reservation in State in which she has settled after marriage. Writ petitions were disposed of by the learned Single Bench while directing the respondent-State to reconsider its policy dated 17.01.1996 in the light of observations made in para 12 of the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Marri Chandra Shekhar Rao Vs. Dean. Seth G.S. Medical College, (1990) 3 SCC 130* and the observations in the order dated 31.03.2017, itself. It was further directed that decision in this regard be taken expeditiously and preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of order and till then interim protection granted to writ petitioners was extended.
2. Present appeal alongwith twelve (12) others were filed by the State of Punjab. It is pointed out that learned Writ Court on 26.10.2016 had directed that any selection would remain subject to decision of the writ petitions.

3. It is brought to our notice by learned counsel for the State that twelve (12) appeals filed by the State were disposed of by the Ist Division bench on 02.11.2018, directing that rights of parties would be governed by final adjudication, to be carried out by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Ranjana Kumari Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others, 2019(1) SCT 25*** and till such adjudication, status quo as on date in respect to the posts in question would be maintained.

4. Present appeal was somehow not decided alongwith and has now been listed before us with the sole respondent not being served as she was not residing at the given address.

5. Learned counsel for the State points out that it has come to their notice that respondent is now residing in Himachal Pradesh and is gainfully employed as Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT). Her services have also been regularized on 23.10.2021. Copy of order dated 23.10.2021, furnished in Court today, is taken on record, subject to just exceptions. Same be scanned by the Registry.

6. In the given facts and circumstances, we do not find any justification in continuance of present proceedings and to insist upon service of respondent which shall be a cause of unnecessary inconvenience to said respondent. The matter has admittedly attained finality in view of judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Ranjana Kumari's*** case (supra). Appellants are at liberty to proceed in accordance with directions dated 02.11.2018 in LPA No.671 of 2018 and others.

7. Appeal is, accordingly, disposed of.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

06.02.2025

Sunil

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