

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP no.9121 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 19.02.2015

Amrik Singh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

1)Whether reporters of local newspapers 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. Madhav Pokhrel, Advocate for
Mr.M.L.Sachdeva , Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Monica Chibber Sharma, DAG, Punjab

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The petitioners' whole case rests on the argument advanced in support of the claim for regularization that the instructions Annexure P-20 would talk of regularization but the benefit has been denied to him solely on the ground that those instructions were a one time measure and the benefit admissible only to those who fulfill all the conditions therein. The petitioner has repeatedly asserted before this Court that interpretation of one time measure being placed on instructions is erroneous as they are silent on this aspect. A perusal of the instructions, relevant of which is extracted herebelow, would show to the contrary:-

“4. That at the time of regularization of the services, the legal opinion could be sought and it should be brought in to the notice of all that the incumbent should have

completed all the conditions and if the employee is left out for regularization for not fulfilling the requisite conditions, his services would not be regularized as it is a one time measure. This work of regularization should be completed within six months of the issue of this letter.”

The petition is therefore dismissed with costs of Rs.5,000/- since the claim raised in the petition is absolutely baseless and the argument raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners an attempt to mislead the Court.

February 19, 2015
rekha

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE