

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

CWP No.5075 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.07.2016

Jang Bahadur

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. S.K.Sharma Budhladawale, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent Nos.1 to 6.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-Jang Bahadur and respondent No.7-Satinder Singh both are stated to be working as Work Inspectors on work charge basis in the Office of General Manager, Punjab Roadways, Jalandhar since 13.03.1985 and 01.04.1994, respectively.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the service of the petitioner has been regularized as Store Attendant (Class-IV post) whereas the service of his junior/respondent No.7 has been regularized as Clerk, which is a Class-III post. Hence, it is claimed that in terms of the regularization policy dated 18.03.2011 (**Annexure P-5**), the case of the petitioner be considered against the post of Work Inspector on which he was working at the time of issuance of the regularization policy.

Upon notice, apart from the reply, an affidavit dated 12.08.2014 of Sh. Bhupinder Singh, Director, State Transport, Punjab, Chandigarh has been filed, wherein it has been stated that keeping in view the qualification as a criteria for regularizing the service of an employee in the light of the

subsequent/amended policy dated 21.11.2011, the services of the petitioner were regularized as Store Attendant because of his being a matriculate, whereas respondent No.7 being B.Sc. 1st Division in Computer Science, his services were regularized as Clerk. The respective services were regularized on 09.02.2012 against different posts keeping in view their specific qualifications and, therefore, no case of discrimination is made out.

At the time of hearing, learned Counsel for the petitioner is unable to show the post of Work Inspector being an encadared post laying down any specific qualification which he possesses and thus entitled to regularization as "Work Inspector".

In view of the aforesaid factual situation, no case for interference is made out.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

July 08, 2016
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE