

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

204

(1) CWP No.28400 of 2013 (O&M)

Sonia BatraPetitioner
Versus

State of U.T.Chandigarh & others ...Respondents

(2) CWP No.9093 of 2014

Parmodh Kumar & othersPetitioners
Versus

State of U.T.Chandigarh & others ...Respondents

Date of decision: 12.10.2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: None for the petitioners.

Ms.Deepali Puri, Advocate, for respondent No.2 & 3.

None for respondent No.4.

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

The present judgment shall dispose of CWP-28400-2013 and 9093-2014, involving common questions of law and facts. However, to dictate orders, facts have been taken from CWP-28400-2013 titled *Sonia Batra Vs. State of U.T. Chandigarh & others*.

Even on the last date of hearing, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner(s).

Challenge in the present writ petition is to the termination of the contract period w.e.f. 31.10.2013, by order dated 22.10.2013 (Annexure P-12), which is stated to be for 6 months, through respondent No.4. Similarly, vide order dated 24.10.2013 (Annexure P-13), respondent-Corporation has relieved the petitioner(s) and stipulated that No Dues Certificate would be issued.

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

204 CWP-28400-2013 & CWP-9093-2014 -2-

In the written statement, filed on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3, the stand is that the petitioner(s) was to be relieved after the expiry of the said period. The appointment was on the basis of walk-in-interview and type-test (Annexure P-1), on contract basis. The agreement was with respondent No.4 on a consolidated amount of Rs.22,300/- per month and it was w.e.f. 26.04.2013 to 25.10.2013, with the condition that it would cease on the completion of the said period, unless extended. Relevant portion of the same reads as under:

“That the contractor is hereby offered contractual employment as Clerk initially w.e.f. 26.04.2013 to 25.10.2013. Unless extended the contractual employment shall automatically cease (sic. cease) on the completion of the said period.”

In view of the above, it is apparent that the appointment was purely contractual which ran out of its tenure and therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the dispensing of services and the present writ petitions are, hereby, dismissed.

12.10.2017
Sailesh

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*