

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CM No. 5517 of 2016 in
CM No. 5009-CWP of 2016 in
CWP No. 5917 of 2016
Date of Decision : 09.05.2016.

Daljeet Singh

...petitioner

Versus

Life Insurance Corporation of India and others

...respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

- 1) *Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2) *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3) *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present: Mr. Akshay Jain, Advocate
for the applicant-respondents.

Mr. Rajesh Arora, Advocate
for the non-applicant/petitioner.

P.B. Bajanthri, J.(Oral)

CM No. 5517 of 2016

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

Reply to the application for vacation of interim order is taken on record.

CM No. 5009-CWP of 2016

The instant application has been filed by the applicant-respondents for vacation of interim order dated 04.04.2016. Reply of the application has been filed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

An identical matter was decided in CWP No. 6754 of 2016, on 29.04.2016 by this Court. Therefore, question of

considering vacation of interim order as well as consideration of reply filed by the petitioner to the application for vacation of interim order need not arise.

In the present petition as well as CWP No. 6754 of 2016, matter pertains to extension of contract appointment. Tenure of the petitioners as contract appointment was over, therefore, question of considering extension or contract appointment by this Court is impermissible in the absence of any legal right.

Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon *Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Bhopal and others Vs. Ms Leena Jain and others*, 2006(11) SCC 350. The issue involved in the aforesaid case is relating to regularization of services. Further petitioner counsel relied on *State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi*, 2006(4) SCC 1. This judgment is not applicable in respect of contract appointment, where term of appointment is fixed and it has ended. In the absence of any legal right, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief and this Court cannot give any writ of mandamus or direction to the respondents. The petitioner has not make out the case, so as to interfere with the matter. Identical issue has been decided in CWP No. 6754 of 2016 dated 29.04.2016.

Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

No order as to costs.

May 09, 2016.
kanchan

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE