

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

CWP No.15430 of 2013
Decided on: 19.12.2015

Ishpreet Kaur Walia & ors.

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab & ors.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Gurnam Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Punjab.

G.S.Sandhawalia, J.(Oral)

The petitioners seek direction for regularization of services with a further prayer that the authorities be restrained from terminating their services till regular appointments are made in pursuance of advertisement No.2/2013 dated 09.06.2013 (Annexure P-14).

While issuing notice of motion counsel for the petitioners had given up his claim for regularization of services of the petitioners and also the claim for restraining the respondent-authorities for terminating the services of the petitioners.

Only grouse of the petitioners was that they were working as Food Processing Instructors under the Guest Faculty Scheme under respondent No.4. On account of the public notice on the basis of which they are apprehending termination, they had also applied against six posts for the Service Providing Trainers. It was their case that the applications had been submitted within the stipulated time frame against six posts for the Nabha district and they possess the essential

qualifications and the requisite experience and were eligible. Their grouse was that the requisite experience certificate had not been issued by respondent No.4 -institute and therefore, they would be denied consideration for appointment to the post in question in the process of selection. This Court vide interim order dated 05.08.2013 had permitted them to participate in the interview process but respondents were directed not to declare their result without permission of this Court.

In the reply filed by respondents No.2 to 4, the plea taken was that the petitioners were working on hourly basis and the posts were purely temporary and their services were renewed on monthly basis. Only petitioner No.1 had approached respondent No.4 for issuance of experience certificate and she was issued the same on the same day.

During the pendency, other petitioners had approached for issuance of the photocopies of the attendance register and the same were also supplied to them. All the petitioners had applied and were allowed to participate in the interview and their result was to be kept in the sealed cover. The case of the petitioners was not covered for regularization on account of instructions dated 18.03.2011 as petitioners had already given up their claim.

Accordingly, keeping in view the fact that the petitioners had also been duly considered as per the interim orders, this Court is of the opinion that the present petition has been rendered infructuous as now the petitioners will be bound by the selection process, which has taken place. In case they are found successful, their grouse for lack of consideration has come to an end and they would be given

necessary appointment orders. Similarly other applicants, who had also applied, will be given necessary consideration. The respondents are directed to open the sealed cover for declaring the result of the selection process and take appropriate action and issue appointment letters in accordance with law.

The writ petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

19.12.2015
sonia

(G.S.SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE