

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

C.W.P. No.7479 of 2015

Date of Decision : 23.04.2015

Ripudaman Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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)

This petition has been filed for a direction to the respondent No.3 to consider the claim of the petitioners with regard to regularization of their *ad hoc* service on the post of Clerks lying vacant in the District & Sessions Division, Chandigarh.

The respondent No.3 advertised posts of Stenographer Grade-III and Clerk on ad hoc basis for six months or till regular appointments are made, whichever is earlier. The petitioners were selected and appointed and have continued. After 1½ months the competent authority issued the advertisement for filling up the same posts on regular basis. The petitioners also applied. After the final selection made by the competent authority the

petitioners were not selected and are now being sought to be relieved in terms of the original advertisement.

The only argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners were appointed after full process was followed and the petitioners have now more than one year experience and therefore their services should be regularized.

I find no weight in the argument of the learned counsel. It is not disputed that the respondent No.3 is not competent to make regular appointments and is competent only to make ad hoc appointments. It is also not disputed that in the original advertisement pursuant to which the petitioners were appointed it was specifically mentioned that the selected candidates will be appointed only for six months or till regular appointments are made, whichever is earlier. It is also not disputed that within a period of 1½ months the advertisement for making the regular appointments was in fact issued by the competent authority. It is also not disputed that the petitioners also applied pursuant to that advertisement but were not found meritorious enough to be selected. In my opinion, no relief can be given to the petitioners.

Petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

April 23, 2015

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**