

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

LPA No.1215 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision :11.07.2017

Kartar Singh and others

....Appellants

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

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

....

Present: Mr.K.L.Arora, Advocate
for the appellants.

....

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

This Appeal is directed against the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 18.03.2017 passed in the Civil Writ Petition and order dated 02.06.2017 passed in the Review Application.

The appellants had approached the writ court with the grievance that the order withdrawing the benefit of regularisation was passed without hearing them, which was accepted by the learned Single Judge to negate the order impugned before him in the writ proceedings. While accepting the challenge and setting aside the impugned order before it the learned Single Judge

granted liberty to the respondents to proceed by issuing necessary notice containing reasons for withdrawal of the regularisation etc.

The appellants have now been issued notice wherein they have been asked to show cause as to why the benefit of regularisation be not withdrawn and their services terminated, which is now a cause of grievance to the appellants, who now contend that assuming that the liberty granted by the learned Single Judge to look into the matter afresh was granted, there was no occasion for the authority to terminate their services.

After hearing the learned counsel for the appellants, we are of the opinion that no interference is warranted as the appellants would have ample remedies in law to question the adverse order passed by the respondents pursuant to the notice. We, however, make it clear that the appellants would be at liberty to raise all the pleas that they have raised before us to protect the benefit of regularisation which they have enjoyed. Besides, since the appellants have been working for more than two decades, we also make it clear that in case any order adverse to the appellants is passed, the same be kept in abeyance for a period of 30 days so as to enable them to seek appropriate remedy against the same.

Apart from this, the appeal is also barred by a delay of 48 days which we do not intend to condone in the absence of any plausible explanation.

Appeal dismissed.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

11.07.2017
dss

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

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