

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

CWP-22025-2016

Date of Decision : 22.10.2016

Sajjan Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam & Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Satbir Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J.(Oral)

The petitioner, who was working as Shift Attendant, has challenged his termination.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the services of the petitioner were terminated by an oral order on 22.02.2015. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner should not be replaced by another contractual employee and in case the respondents intend to engage another contractual employee, the petitioner should be given preference. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner shall be satisfied if this petition is treated as a representation and respondents are directed to consider and decide the same, in accordance with law, in the light of judgment passed by this Court in CWP No. 1593 of 2009 titled

Surender Singh and others Vs. Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and others, decided on 12.10.2009.

The prayer of learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be reasonable.

Without making any observations on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to dispose of this petition with a direction to respondent No. 2 to treat this petition as a representation and decide the same, in accordance with law, in the light of judgment passed in case of ***Surender Singh and others (supra)*** and other relevant material within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

October 22, 2016.
kanchan

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No