

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.16098 of 2017

Date of Decision: July 25, 2017

Randhir and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondents regularized the services of other similarly situated employees in the year 2005-06, on the basis of a scheme promulgated in the year 1991, in which the petitioners allegedly were not regularized (at that time) on the ground that those who were regularized were senior to them.

If that stand of the respondents was factually incorrect, the petitioners should have approached this Court, to avail their remedy, well in time in the year 2006, or soon thereafter.

Thereafter in any case, the judgment in the case of **The Secretary, State of Karnatka and others Vs. Uma Devi and others**, 2006 (4) SCC 1 having come about, and 11 years having elapsed even since the regularization of those with whom the petitioners claim parity, I find no ground to entertain this petition.

It is therefore dismissed.

If, however, the petitioners herein fall within the scope of the

instructions for regularization of the Government issued in the year 2014, which are under challenge in CWP no.17206 of 2014, **Yogesh Tyagi and others v. State of Haryana and others**, their claim for regularisation would be considered if the validity of those instructions is upheld by this Court.

July 25, 2017	(Amol Rattan Singh)
vcgarg	Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	Yes