

CWP No.14642 of 2015

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

C.W.P. No.14642 of 2015

Date of Decision : 22.07.2015

Jagdeep

..... Petitioner

Versus

District Judge-cum-Appellate Tribunal, Rohtak and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

- 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?

AJAY TEWARI, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner was appointed as Clerk-cum-computer operator in the respondent-society on 03.11.2009. Thereafter, by order dated 26.09.2010, he was confirmed. Shortly, thereafter on 23.12.2010 Dr. R.P. Hooda, the then Vice Chancellor of M.D. University, Rohtak was appointed as an Administrator of the respondent-society for a period of 6 months since there was a dispute regarding the elections to do the following acts:-

- (i) settle the electoral college of the Society,
- (ii) hold elections of the office bearers of the Society and
- (iii)manage the affairs of the Society during the intervening period.

During that period he formed the committee to go into the staff pattern of the college where the petitioner was employed. The committee recommended that the work of a Clerk-cum-computer operator was there. However, the Administrator came to the conclusion that there was a financial crunch and the post had never been sanctioned by the society. In the circumstances, notwithstanding the recommendation that there was a work, the services of the petitioner were terminated in terms of the appointment letter. The petitioner approached this court which relegated him into an appeal. The appeal having been dismissed he is before this court.

I put it to learned counsel whether the reasons which weighed for terminating his services were incorrect. Learned counsel has very fairly stated that he is not in a position to deny the fact that there was financial crunch or that the post against which the petitioner was appointed was not a sanctioned post. Once that is so, I do not see any reason to take a different view than that taken by the appellate-authority.

Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

July 22, 2015

sanjiv

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE