

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

**CWP No.26070 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 15.05.2017**

Rajbala

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(ORAL)

By this petition the petitioner has claimed that date of regularization of her services be predated from 08.05.2012 to 01.04.2011 on the ground that certain persons from District Panipat had been granted this benefit.

The petitioner had earlier filed CWP No.7681 of 2016 which was disposed of by this Court with a direction to the respondents to consider her representation and pass a speaking order. Her representation having been rejected by order (Annexure P-7) she is before this Court. I find from the averments made that the only ground taken by the petitioner is that persons in Panipat had earlier approached this Court and this Court had directed the respondents to consider their claim and in those cases the respondents have given them the benefit of predated regularization on the specific ground of parity with persons junior to them.

In the present case, there is no averment that any person junior to the petitioner has been granted the benefit of regularization from 01.04.2011 and the only ground laid for claiming the benefit is the example of employees who are working in Panipat. In the impugned order it has been recorded that originally once CWP No.5926 of 2001 titled as ***Vidya Devi and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** had come up before this Court which had been disposed of on 20.02.2002 and it was pursuant to the directions given by this Court in that judgment that a policy dated 11.11.2003 was framed for regularization of the services of Class IV employees working on part time basis against regular sanctioned posts. As per that policy the District Education Officer, Sonipat had prepared a District level common seniority list of all such employees as on 30.06.2003 for regularizing their services against vacant regular sanctioned posts and it was as per that seniority list and the availability of the regular sanctioned vacant posts that the services of the petitioner were regularized w.e.f 08.05.2012. The impugned order also noticed that the petitioner was claiming benefit on the basis of the date of regularization given to employees of different Districts which was not permissible since they were in a different cadre.

In the circumstances, I find no fault in the impugned order.
Petition stands dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

15.05.2017
pooja sharma-I

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No