

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

**CWP No. 2700 of 2017
Date of Decision: 14.02.2017**

Harbhajan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Others

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. J. P. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R. S. Sidhu, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The petitioner herein are aggrieved against the inaction of the respondents-State in regularizing his services as per Punjab Government's Policy dated 18.03.2011 (*Annexure P-6*).

Counsel for the petitioner submits that an enquiry was conducted as to whether the services of the petitioner herein should be regularized as per the Punjab Government's policy dated 18.03.2011 and the enquiry officer came to the conclusion that the technical education of the 10 workers including the petitioner herein is similar to the workers who had been regularized earlier and that the said qualification of the petitioner herein was prior to the regularization of the similarly situated persons. It was recommended that the services of the worker, petitioner herein, should be regularized as per the present policy of the Government. Despite a representation having been moved in this regard, services of the petitioner

herein have not been regularized to date. Aggrieved, the instant petition has been filed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and found that there is a gross inaction on the part of the respondents-State in taking a conscious decision on the representation that was made.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. R. S. Sidhu, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State. Let four copies of the paper book be served upon him during the course of the day.

Counsel for the respondents-State submits that representation of the petitioner will be decided as expeditiously as possible.

In view of the very fair submission that has been made, without commenting on the merits of the case, this writ petition is disposed with directions to petitioner herein to furnish a fresh representation along with a certified copy of this order within a period of two weeks. In case, such representation is filed before the respondents-State, the same be decided by passing a speaking order within a period of two months thereafter. Needless to say, in case petitioner is found entitled to the relief as claimed, the needful be done within a period of one month thereafter.

Disposed of.

February 14, 2017
Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No