

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

1) LPA No.1125 of 2017

Shyam Lal and others

....Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

2) LPA No.1142 of 2017

Ram Niwas and another

....Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

Date of Decision : 29.08.2017

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr.Ramesh Goyat, Advocate
for the appellants.

...

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

By this order we dispose of both the aforementioned
appeals arising from a common judgment.

The appellants are in appeal against the judgment of
learned Single Judge dated 01.05.2017.

The facts are undisputed that the appellants' services had
been regularised in the year 1993 and some other persons in the
organization whose particulars have been given were also regularised
somewhere around that time. The appellants are, however, aggrieved
with the date of regularisation assigned to some of those who filed
civil suits and writ petitions resulting in a decision in the year 2009-

2010 giving them regularisation from an antedate as they have sought.

Learned counsel for the appellants contends that even though he did not file any suit or writ petition, but on the parity of the reasoning where courts had granted a date of regularation in favour of the said incumbents, he too would have to be assigned regularisation with effect from the same date as has been done in the cases of those persons. The learned Single Judge dismissed the plea as the appellants had filed the writ petition in the year 2013 even though the orders in favour of the said incumbents fructified in the year 2009-10. It is a settled proposition of law that a person has to be vigilant and has to approach the court within a reasonable time preferably within one year. Three years is also limitation to file a civil suit. Once it was known to the appellants that similarly situated persons have been granted a benefit, it was incumbent upon them to approach this Court. In fact, it was a cause individual to them and should have provoked them to file writ petition at much earlier point of time.

No ground to interfere.

Dismissed.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

29.08.2017
dss

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

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