

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.10598 of 2015

Date of decision: 25.05.2015.

Mukesh Kumar and others

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment? Yes/No

2. To be referred to reporters or not? Yes/No

3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

Present: Mr. R.K. Malik, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of *certiorari* to quash the action of the respondents, whereby, the claim of the petitioners for regularization in the light of the policy decision dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-1) and letter dated 28.07.2014 (Annexure P-2) has not been considered and also for issuance of direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners for regularization in the light of the policy decision dated 18.06.2014 and 28.07.2014 as other similarly situated employees have already been regularized.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners fulfill all the terms and conditions of the policy (Annexures P-1 and P-2) and their cases were also recommended stating therein that they fulfill all the terms and conditions of the policy but still they

are not being considered. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners have also moved a representation to the authorities concerned but so far no action has been taken thereupon so far. He further submits that the cases of other similarly situated employees have been considered, whereas, the claim of the present petitioners has not been considered.

Learned senior arguing counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners would be satisfied, in case, a direction is issued by this Court to respondent No.2 to take action as per recommendations (Annexures P-3 and P-4) made by General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Jind Depot, within some stipulated period as other similarly situated employees have been regularized.

In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the claim of the petitioners in view of policy decision (Annexures P-1 and P-2) and also the recommendation as made in Annexures P-3 and P-4, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

However, in case, the petitioners are found to be entitled in view of the said policy decisions and also the recommendation, the necessary relief be granted to them within a period of three months thereafter.

The petition is disposed of accordingly.

25.05.2015
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE