

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 849 of 2000(O&M)

Date of decision:27.9.2016

Balwant Singh & ors.

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & ors.

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Thakur, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

The learned counsel for the petitioner has produced office order No.143/Establishment-II, dated October 4, 2002 passed during the early stages of the pendency of this petition by which the relief prayed for has been granted to the petitioners and their services as daily wagers have been regularized w.e.f. March 31, 1993 in Group-C service [instead of Group-B] in the pay scales mentioned against the names of each of them. The claim is for regularisation in Group B. The photocopy of the office order is retained on record as Mark 'A' which is not a disputed document by the respondents.

There are in all five petitioners, namely, Balwant Singh, Anil Kumar, Sushil Kumar, Ashwani Kumar and Ram Lal in the array of the petitioning parties. The office order relates to Balwant Singh, Ashwani Kumar, Kamaljit Singh, Ram Lal and Anil Kumar. The name of petitioner No.3 Sushil Kumar does not find mention in the office order. This order renders the writ petition infructuous since the fruit of litigation is brought home but with the caveat entered that as far as petitioner No.3- Sushil Kumar is concerned, he alone would be at liberty to apply to this Court for

revival of this case, in case relief has not been granted to him already by the respondent department.

With this protection afforded to petitioner No.3, the petition stands dismissed as infructuous.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

27.09.2016
monika

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>