Amit Kumar
2018.02.23 16:24
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

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

**CWP No. 4330 of 2018
Date of Decision 22.2.2018**

Sube Singh and another ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

****

**ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL)**

A writ in the nature of Certiorari is prayed for, to quash the order dated 19.2.2007 (Annexure P-6), vide which respondent No.1 had declined to adjust the employees in the Municipal Committees, who had served during the strike period.

A mass strike was observed by the employees of the Municipal Committees in the State of Haryana w.e.f. 16.2.1996 to 13.1.1997. Resultantly, many persons, including the petitioners, offered their services, and were engaged to tied over the crisis. However, the regular staff of the Municipal Committees, after the strike was called off, resumed duties. And resultantly, the petitioners, and all those who were identically placed, were rendered surplus. The case of the petitioners is that the Government had taken a decision to absorb the surplus staff, that helped the Government during strike. But no formal decision as regards their absorption was taken. Petitioner No.1 alleged to have obtained information under the Right to Information Act, to ascertain the status of his claim. In

Amit Kumar
2018.02.23 16:24
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document



response, vide letter dated 11.2.2013 (Annexure P-5), petitioners were informed that a conscious decision dated 19.2.2007 (Annexure P-6), was taken by the Government, not to adjust any employee, who worked during the period of strike in the year 1996-97. Concededly, over a decade has gone by. If the claim of the petitioners was ignored or was not being considered, they ought to have approached the Court within a reasonable time. Even the information sought by petitioner No.1 was furnished as back as on 11.2.2013, i.e. over five years ago. It is not the case of the petitioners either that any person, who was identically placed and circumstanced, was absorbed or adjusted by the respondents, despite the decision dated 19.2.2007 (Annexure P-6).

In conspectus of the above, the only and the inevitable conclusion that could be reached is; the petition not only suffers from delay and laches, but also lacks merits. And is accordingly dismissed.

22.2.2018 **(ARUN PALLI)**
AK Sharma **JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES / NO
Whether Reportable: YES / NO