

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

119

CWP No.14491 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 07, 2017

Ram Rattan

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Munish Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

Pleadings on record would indicate that the petitioner is serving as a Guest Faculty Instructor (Fitter Trade) at Industrial Training Institute, Haryana, District Hoshiarpur. Counsel submits that the petitioner was engaged in December 2011 and the contractual arrangement was extended from time to time.

The instant writ petition has been filed, praying for issuance of writ of mandamus to direct the respondents not to replace the petitioner with another similar contractual arrangement.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

In the considered view of this Court, the instant petition is founded merely on an apprehension. There is no document/material placed on record wherefrom this Court can

infer that respondent No.3-Institute has taken any step towards inviting applications to engage an instructor in the Fitter Trade on contractual basis. Even counsel appearing for the petitioner would concede that till date, no public notice/advertisement has been issued.

Under Such circumstances, no cause of action has accrued to the petitioner for this Court to entertain the instant petition.

No interference at this stage is called for.

Petition is disposed of.

It would however be open for the petitioner to approach this Court at a stage when the respondent-Institute takes any concrete steps and which would reflect that one contractual arrangement is sought to be replaced by another.

Disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

07.07.2017

anju rani

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