

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

**Civil Writ Petition No. 21374 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.10.2016**

Jagjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Shiromani Gurudwara Parbhandhak Committee
through its President, Sri Amritsar Sahib and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. M.S. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner-Jagjit Singh was appointed as a temporary *Granthi* on wages of ₹ 150/- per day for a period of six months vide order dated 12.04.2013 (**Annexure P-3**), passed by Shiromani Gurudwara Parbhandhak Committee (in short 'SGPC') and directed to join at Gurudwara, Nada Sahib, Panchkula (Haryana); he was required to clear a test before the Sub Committee in terms of order dated 12.04.2013 (**P-3**). On having failed the test, the petitioner was declared unfit for duty and, therefore, relieved on 08.07.2013.

The petitioner was once again appointed on the same terms on 30.07.2013 on temporary basis for a period of 89 days, the period was extended from time to time, and vide report dated 15.01.2015, he is stated to have passed the test. The last extension was granted to the petitioner till 23.07.2015.

The petitioner, in the present petition, is seeking setting aside

the order dated 11.09.2015 (**Annexure P-5**) whereby his services has been

ordered to be terminated; with a further prayer for direction to the SGPC for deciding his representation dated 15.11.2015 (**Annexure P-6**) against illegal termination.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that termination of the petitioner has been ordered on account of alleged complaints from the General Public regarding his incompetence, as also of the Manager, without any opportunity of explaining his position regarding the said complaints, therefore, it is prayed that the said termination order dated 11.09.2015 (**P-5**) be set aside.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, no case for interference is warranted.

The engagement of the petitioner was on contractual basis; the period stood lapsed on 23.07.2015 and there was no further extension. It is conceded that the petitioner had absolutely no right to hold the post and in terms of the nature of engagement, his services could be dispensed with at any stage. The petitioner has, after a delay of more than one year, now sought to challenge the non-extension of his service period, which in the opinion of this Court is quite belated.

In view of above, no case for interference is made out, accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

October 17, 2016

'dk kamra'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No