

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.12974 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.08.2016

Surinder		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents
		CWP No.12970 of 2016 (O&M)
Tara Chand		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents
		CWP No.12971 of 2016 (O&M)
Jagiro Devi		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents
		CWP No.12972 of 2016 (O&M)
Soma Devi		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents
		CWP No.12973 of 2016 (O&M)
Aman Kumar		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents
		CWP No.12975 of 2016 (O&M)
Kamil		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents
		CWP No.12976 of 2016 (O&M)
Shkuntla		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA
Present:- Mr. R.S.Mamli, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of CWP Nos.12974 of 2016 titled as Surinder Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.12970 of 2016 titled as Tara Chand Vs. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.12971 of 2016 titled as Jagiro Devi Vs. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.12972 of 2016 titled as Soma Devi Vs. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.12973 of 2016 titled as Aman Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.12975 of 2016 titled as Kamil Vs. State of Haryana and others and CWP No.12976 of 2016 titled as Shkuntla Vs. State of Haryana and others as the prayer made in these bunch of petitions is for grant of benefit of regularization in service.

Counsel would submit that the petitioners in these seven connected petitions were engaged as daily wagers under the various departments, State of Haryana on various dates between the years 1982 to 1993. It is contended that since the date of joining the petitioners have served continuously and are working even to date.

Counsel argues that the State Government has formulated policies on the subject of regularization in service in the years 1993, 1996, 2003 and 2014 and in spite of the petitioners being eligible under such policies, the benefit has not been granted to them.

Pleadings on record do not indicate the precise period for which each of the petitioners in these petitions has served with the respondent Department. Even an appointment letter has not been placed on record. Counsel would submit that appointment letters were not issued to the daily wagers and their names are reflected only in the muster role and which are not in the possession of the petitioners. He further submits that

the daily wages were released to the petitioners against receipts and which are also in the possession of the respondent Department.

Under such circumstances and without making any observations on merit, the present writ petitions are disposed of in terms of granting liberty to the petitioners to approach the appropriate respondent authorities/competent authority with regard to their claim.

Suffice it to observe that in the eventuality of any such claim seeking benefit of regularization being submitted, the respondent authority would be obligated to examine the same strictly in accordance with law and against the backdrop of the relevant policies framed by the State Government on the subject of regularization and to dispose of the same expeditiously.

Disposed of.

16.08.2016

vandana

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No