

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

**CWP No.20932 of 2014
Decided on : 12.05.2016**

Inder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : Mr. S.K. Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Avinit Avasthi, AAG, Punjab.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks the benefit of regularization of service w.e.f. 05.02.1991 with all consequential benefits. It is the case of the petitioner that he was appointed as Tehsil Welfare Officer vide order dated 21.03.1989 (Annexure P-1) for 89 days in the pay-scale of ₹1500-2640, on temporary basis. The appointment had continued, thereafter, till 04.05.1990 when he was relieved.

He had approached this Court by filing CWP No.7997 of 1990 seeking consideration for regularization and for quashing of the said order, which was disposed of in view of the instructions as well as judgment in the case of ***Piara Singh Vs. State of Haryana 1989 (1) PLR 396***. He, thereafter, filed COCP No.972 of 1990 and an appointment order dated 29.01.1991 (Annexure P-5)

was issued and he was again appointed on temporary basis, subject to the final decision in **State of Haryana Vs. Piara Singh 1992 (4) SCC 118** before the Apex Court, which was thereafter, finally decided on 12.08.1992. It is his case that since then his case is pending for regularization and there was a recommendation also as per the Government instructions in his favour.

The State in its defence has taken the plea that the matter of regularization of the petitioner is under active consideration of the Government and likely to be finalized shortly. It is mentioned that a three member Committee headed by the Director, Department of Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes was constituted to make recommendations about regularization of the service of the petitioner.

A perusal of the contents of Annexure R-2 would go on to show that the Committee on 30.05.2013 had proposed to get extension in time schedule beyond 4 months from the Department of Personnel before taking a decision on the issue of regularization. It is, thus, apparent that the decision making process is still under consideration and the petitioner is on the verge of his retirement and is superannuating on 31.01.2017, as contended by the counsel for the petitioner.

In such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that

the submission made by the counsel for the petitioner that decision making process be completed within a time bound frame is justified.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.1 to take a decision on the regularization of the service of the petitioner within a period of 3 months from the receipt of the certified copy of this order, after taking appropriate extension from the Department of Personnel.

MAY 12, 2016
Naveen

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE