

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

Date of decision: 11.04.2016

CWP No.16409 of 2013

Pargas Singh & others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Ravi Kant Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Dr. Puneet Kaur Sekhon, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

1. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
2. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

The claim in this joint petition instituted by four petitioners is for extension in service beyond the age of superannuation based on policies of the Punjab Government. They were employees of the Punjab Small Industries & Export Corporation – respondent No.2

It is the stand of respondent No.2 that three of the petitioners i.e. petitioners No.1, 2 & 4 did not opt for extension in service before retirement within the time prescribed in the policies/instructions for exercising their options. They woke up only after they stood retired from service. On the other hand, petitioner No.3 retired as a work-charged employee and such employees are not covered by Rule 3.26 of the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume I,

Part I in view of the Full Bench decision of this Court in Lakha Singh Vs. State of Punjab & others, 2016 (1) SCT 179; 2015 (5) Law Herald 4038. In that view of this, none of the petitioners qualify for or have demonstrated actionable claim for extension in service in the Corporation beyond superannuation as a matter of right.

Consequently, this petition has no merit and is hereby dismissed.

11.04.2016
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE