

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

LPA No.2491 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 21.02.2017

Jai Kumar

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Land Reclamation and
Development Corporation Ltd. and another

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DR.SHEKHER DHAWAN

Present: Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate
for the appellant.

.....

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

This appeal is directed against the judgment of the learned
Single Judge dated 05.09.2016.

The appellant, who was working with the respondent-
Corporation as Junior Engineer, was appointed on 24.01.1989 for a
period of 89 days on adhoc basis. After some time his service on
adhoc basis was converted to a daily wage labourer but the adhoc
appointment was again restored in 1993. In 1997 he faced termination
which he questioned by way of the writ petition resulting in the
impugned order.

Before the learned Single Judge an argument was raised
that services of other employees who were in service stood
regularised in the year 2001 with effect from the date of their
appointment and had the services of the appellant not been terminated
he too would have been regularised. Before us an argument has been

raised that since the policy of regularisation came in 1994 enabling incumbents to regularisation of their services on completion of two years, the appellant having been appointed in 1989 stood to benefit from the policy which was denied to him.

On due consideration of the matter, we are of the opinion that from the entire sequence of events and record the appellant has failed to show that he ever pressed for regularisation during the time when he was in service i.e. from 1994 to 1997. There is not a word in the writ petition to that effect and if that be so, then the prayer of the appellant that if he had continued in service in contingency he would have been regularised as was done in the cases of other persons, would be difficult to accept. We, therefore do not find any reason to interfere.

Appeal dismissed.

However, for the reasons stated in the application marginal delay of 8 days in filing the appeal is condoned in the interest of justice.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

21.02.2017
dss

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No