

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.24097 of 2015

Date of Decision: 04.02.2016

Sandeep Kumar and others

... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Srawaan, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

1. The claim is based on a process initiated in 2007 for training Security Guards. The petitioners assert that they were put to physical test and medical examination but they were not offered jobs for imparting vocational training to unemployed youth for the Security Sector. From 2007-09 the petitioners appear not to taken recourse to legal remedy and have approached this Court in the present petition after serving a legal notice on the respondents on September 07, 2015. The legal notice was duly attended to and a reply thereto was conveyed and a copy of which notice has been placed on file as Annexure P-5 addressed to the learned counsel who served the notice on behalf of the petitioners. It has been explained therein that the training imparted for two months' duration which was free of cost and no fee was charged from the candidates.

2. The Punjab Government did not offer or promise jobs to the

petitioners or to anyone that applied under the scheme advertised on September 08, 2007. The youth chosen to respond to the training programme would have on successful completion of the course a certificate enabling them to obtain secure jobs as private Security Guards in private security outfits supplying security guards to companies for industrial security. It is apparent that the scheme was not designed as a stepping stone to Government service.

3. Assuming arguendo that there was indeed a promise held out for employment in government or public sector in the terms and conditions of the advertisement issued in 2007 it did not fructify in appointments then the petition has been filed after inordinate delay and laches and the rigour mortis of limitation has set in which is sufficient to deprive the petitioners of a right of consideration for alteration of seniority after lapse of more than 8 years from the relevant point of departure when military concession benefit of seniority was given to the ex-servicemen respondents.

4. No ground is made out for interference. The petition stands dismissed.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

04.02.2016
manju