

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.11330 of 2015
Date of Decision: May 28, 2015

Krishan Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr.Jagtar Kureel, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court challenging the impugned order dated 25.11.2014 (Annexure P-5), whereby his services have been dispensed with.

The petitioner is stated to have been discharging the duties of Beldar.

The contention of the petitioner is that the respondents are not renewing the contract of the contractual employees and replacing the contractual employees with another set of contractual employees in order to resort to regular appointment. Counsel submits that there is a clear cut violation of the judgment in **Hargurpratap Singh Versus State of Punjab & others, 2007(13) SCC 292**. He further submits that though the services

of the petitioner have been dispensed with, but in case the respondents choose to appoint contractual employees, preference should be given to the petitioner as he had already gained experience by working in the office of the Management till the Management resorts to process of appointing the employees on regular basis.

The prayer of the petitioner is fair and justified.

The writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents that in case the respondents appoint any contractual employee, the name of the petitioner be also considered for being appointed as contractual employee till the respondents undergo process of appointing employees on regular basis.

May 28, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE