

**Sr. No. 112
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.13587 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.07.2016**

Veena Kumari

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. R.K.Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Bhupinder Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

Claim in the present petition is for regularization of service of the petitioner.

Brief facts pleaded are that the petitioner was appointed as Art and Craft Teacher on ad hoc basis on 13.09.1994. State Government issued policy dated 01.10.2003 to regularize the service of such ad hoc employees who have completed three years service on 30.09.2003. It is the case of the petitioner that in spite of being eligible under the policy dated 01.10.2003, benefit of regularization was not granted as she was involved in FIR No.22 dated 12.02.2002. In the trial that ensued, petitioner has earned acquittal vide judgment dated 19.12.2013 passed by the trial Court. Petitioner thereafter filed representation to consider her case for regularization in the light of policy dated 01.10.2003. It has been averred that the case of the petitioner for regularization was even duly forwarded by the competent authority.

Learned Senior counsel would submit that even though the

regularization policy dated 01.10.2003 had been withdrawn on 13.04.2007 but subsequently Haryana Government had issued a Notification dated 18.06.2014 in terms of which the left over Group 'C' and 'D' employees working on ad hoc/contract/daily wage/work charge basis and could not be regularized under the earlier regularization policies including 01.10.2003 but were otherwise eligible were now to be regularized with effect from the dates they were eligible for regularization.

Grievance of the petitioner in a nut shell is that in spite of working continuously as Art and Craft Teacher on ad hoc basis since 15.09.1994 and being covered under the policy dated 01.10.2003, the State Government/competent authority is not taking a final decision with regard to her claim for regularization in service.

In the light of facts and circumstances noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition with a direction to respondent No.2 to treat the present petition itself as a representation and to take a final decision on the claim of the petitioner as regards regularization of service strictly in accordance with law and under the relevant policy issued by the State Government on the subject of regularization and by passing a speaking order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Disposed of.

14.07.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**