

213

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

CWP-19350-2013

Date of Decision :21.03.2017

JAIPAL SINGH & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. R.S.Malik, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Kuldeep Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

P.B.BAJANTHRI, J. (ORAL)

In the instant petition, the petitioners have sought for quashing of Annexure P-10 dated 17.07.2013 by which their grievances relating to regularization of their services have been rejected with reference to the ranking assigned for the purpose of regularization of Science Master.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the petitioners are entitled for second prayer that their names are required to be considered for regularization in the light of policy decision vide Annexure P-6 dated 01.10.2003 containing that the petitioners fulfill the requisite qualification and eligibility criteria laid down in the notification dated 01.10.2003.

The petitioners have not submitted any representation to the concerned respondents. In the absence of necessary demand before the competent authority, the petitioners are not entitled for any direction to the concerned respondent for consideration of the petitioners name for regularization, in light of the policy decision vide Annexure P-6. Therefore, the petitioners are not entitled for the second relief to the extent that they are

entitled for a direction to the concerned respondent for consideration of their names for regularization. Thus the petitioners have not made out a case so as to seek a direction. It is evident from Annexure P-10 that the petitioners names are at serial No.381 and 408, whereas the regular appointment was given up to merit No.224. Thus the petitioners have not made out a case so as to interfere with Annexure P-10. Hence, the petition stands dismissed. Dismissal of this order will not come in the way of petitioners to approach the concerned respondent by apprising the service particulars of the petitioners read with the regularization policy so also the contention of the petitioner that the petitioners juniors services have been regularized. If such a representation is made by the petitioners, the concerned respondent would consider the same.

Learned counsel for the petitioner at this stage relied on Annexure P-8 stating that they have submitted their representation through Advocate. It is to be noted that with reference to legal notice they have approached this Court on earlier occasion, the same was considered by this Court. Thus the representation Annexure P-8 merges with the speaking order dated Annexure P-10. Hence the petition is dismissed with cost of ₹5000/-. The cost shall be paid by the petitioners to the respondent-Department.

Petition stands dismissed with cost.

(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

March 21, 2017
Sunil Devi

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No