

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.13141 of 2016

Date of Decision: 08.07.2016

Ram Bhaj and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Arvind Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

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

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.

Claims that persons who were appointed after the petitioners have been regularized in service while the petitioners have been ignored. The list of those who were junior to petitioner No.1 and petitioner No.2 are at pages 17 to 19 of the paper book (total 41).

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that persons placed in similar circumstances had approached this Court and on directions issued to the respondents their cases have been decided in their favour. Their services have been regularized. Therefore, it would be a waste of time to issue notice of motion in this case only to await reply from the State even when its decision in the respective cases is not known.

To this end, the petitioners have served a legal notice dated February 17, 2016 (Annex P-4) which has not received the due attention of the competent authority so far. Since the decision has not been taken, the prayer of the petitioners is accepted and a direction is issued to the 3rd

respondent to consider and decide the aforesaid legal notice in terms of the order passed in cases of similarly situated persons, one of which is placed at Annex P-6 with the petition. A direction is issued to 3rd respondent to decide the case within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. In case, the petitioners are required to be heard the opportunity may be afforded to them before finalizing their case. The final order be communicated to the petitioners forthwith.

With these observations and directions, the petition stands disposed of.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

08.07.2016
manju