

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

Date of Decision:- 25.01.2018

1. C.W.P No. 8775 of 2016 (O&M)

Rampal

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

2. C.W.P No. 10161 of 2016 (O&M)

Des Raj

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

3. C.W.P No. 8936 of 2016 (O&M)

Baljit Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

4. C.W.P No. 9277 of 2016 (O&M)

Prem Pal

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

5. C.W.P No. 19284 of 2016 (O&M)

Ashok Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Sakshi Saini, Advocate, for
Mr. H.P.S. Isher, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Mr. Pale Ram, Advocate, for
Mr. Jaspal Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.5.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

This order will dispose of above-mentioned five writ petitions in terms of orders passed in C.W.P. No. 8646 of 2016, decided on 29.08.2017, titled Mamta Vs. State of Haryana & Ors., on the point of alternative remedy where the disputed questions of fact have been resolved.

For the sake of convenience the order has been reproduced below:-

“ Petitioner seeks the benefit of regularization from the due date along with all consequential benefits, on account of the fact that many juniors have been regularized. It has been averred that the petitioner had joined in the Forest Department in the year 1997 and has been paid at DC rates and thus, claims regularization on the basis of the policy issued by the State.

The respondents, in their reply, have categorically stated that they never engaged the petitioner for any work even for a single day and therefore, she is not covered under any Government policy.

The said reply was filed on 27.10.2016. No replication has been filed to controvert the same. A period of more than

10 months have expired since then. Disputed questions of facts are arising as to whether the petitioner was ever in service or not as she herself has not attached any appointment letter or proof of service in support of her claim by way of annexures.

*In **Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation and another Vs. Casteribe Rajya Parivahan Karmchari Sanghatana, 2009 (8) SCC 556**, the Apex Court has held that the Industrial Tribunal is empowered to grant permanency to the workers who are victim of unfair labour practice and once the same is established, affirmative action can be taken accordingly. The Apex Court in **Hari Nandan Prasad & another Vs. Employer I/R to Mangmt. Of FCI & another 2014 (3) JT 415**, followed that view and has held that regularization can also be enforced by the Industrial Tribunal.*

Resultantly, since disputed questions of facts are arising and since the petitioner has an alternative remedy available, the present petition is disposed of, with the liberty afore-stated.”

Ordered accordingly.

January 25, 2018
tripti

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

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