

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

CWP No.30019 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.02.2018

Hans Raj and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. J.S. Mundi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By way of the present petition, the petitioner(s) seek(s) issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of impugned orders dated 10.10.2017 (Annexure P-9 and P-10) vide which the claim of the petitioners for reappointment was rejected.

It is asserted that the petitioners were appointed as Home Guards and their services were terminated on account of shortage of funds despite the fact that respondent No.3 had written various letters to respondent No.2 to deploy additional force for strengthening the security. Learned counsel refers to Annexure P-2 to contend that the State has sanctioned 349 posts of Home Guard volunteers in various districts and 92 posts were sanctioned for Sangrur District and all these posts were ordered to be filled up by re-calling and re-enrolling the Home Guard Volunteers. He further states that the petitioners and one Ajit Singh submitted the application before the competent authority, whereby said

Ajit Singh has been appointed, whereas the petitioners were deprived of the relief.

Heard.

The petitioners were inducted as Home Guards on temporary basis by the competent authority. Petitioner No.1 Hans Raj and petitioner No.2 Krishan Singh were recruited as volunteers on 20.10.1991 and 05.08.1988 respectively. Both of them had left the duty on various dates during the year 1994 and 1995, without knowledge and intimation to the competent authority. Thereafter, their services were terminated after getting approval from the competent authority. Petitioner No.3 was recruited on 16.03.1992 as volunteer and left duty on various dates during year 1992 to 1995. Since the petitioners were recruited on temporary basis as per requirement by the State, the claim raised in the present petition is not sustainable. The petitioners left their duties about 22-25 years back. The competent authority after considering their representation has rightly rejected the claim of the petitioners. Therefore, at this belated stage, the prayer made in the instant petition deserves to be declined.

Dismissed.

06.02.2018

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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