

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

Sr. No.112+246

CWP No.2855 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.01.2016

Nitin Sharma

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. S.N. Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

C.M. No.825-CWP of 2016

Through the present application, replication to the written statement filed on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 is sought to be placed on the record.

Allowed as prayed for.

CM stands disposed of.

Main Case

On 27.06.2011, the petitioner was selected as Computer Operator/Data Entry Operator in the respondent-Department on contract basis.

In pursuance to the aforesaid selection, the petitioner joined his services on 01.07.2011. The services of the petitioner, were, thereafter, extended from time to time and the last extension granted was till 31.12.2014. In the meanwhile, no further extension to his services was

granted in view of the impugned order dated 05.02.2015 (Annexure P-9), as per which on account of pendency of disciplinary enquiry against the petitioner, no extension could be granted to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the disciplinary enquiry, the petitioner has been exonerated. He further submits that similarly situated employees who were appointed alongwith the petitioner have been regularized.

In view of the aforesaid facts, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present writ petition to make a comprehensive representation to respondent No.2 with regard to claim for regularization of his services as has been done in the case of similarly situated employees.

Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

If any such representation, the liberty of which has been sought and got, is made by the petitioner, respondent No.2 is directed to take a decision thereupon expeditiously but not later than three months from the date of receipt of such representation by passing a well reasoned and speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

Needless to add that the decision so taken be communicated to the petitioner and if the decision is not to the satisfaction of the petitioner, he would be at liberty to challenge the same, in accordance with law.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

January 21, 2016
Jyoti 1