

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

CWP-9792-2015

Date of Decision: March 19, 2018

Khajan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Chander Pal Tiwana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Doon, AAG, Haryana.

ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL)

Services of the petitioner were regularised as Labourer, in Grade-D, w.e.f. 01.10.2003, in the pay scale of Rs.2550-55-2660-EB-60-3200 plus usual allowances, pursuant to an order dated 19.02.2007 (Annexure P-2). The limited grievance that he has is, that his services ought to have been regularised in terms of the regularisation policy, dated 18.03.1996 (Annexure P-3), w.e.f. 01.02.1996.

Having argued the matter at some length, learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the written statement filed on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4 is vague, for, nothing is specified as to for what reason the claim of the petitioner cannot be countenanced. Accordingly, it is submitted that let this petition be disposed of only with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the claim/grievance of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders.

Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with a direction to the

respondents to consider the petition at hands as a representation on behalf of the petitioner. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law, within three months from today. However, in the event the claim of the petitioner is declined, the respondent authorities shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons in support thereof.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

March 19, 2018

P Kapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES / NO

Whether Reportable: YES / NO