

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

CWP No.665 of 2018  
Date of decision: 16.01.2018

Laxmi Chand @ Lakshmi Chand @ Lachhmi Chand

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Rakesh Bakshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Petitioner joined as Safai Karamchari on 01.12.1998 in Municipal Committee Yamuna Nagar on ad hoc basis. Subsequently, he was posted at Municipal Council Indri (Karnal) w.e.f. 13.12.2001 (Annexure P3). While he was posted at Indri, the Government of Haryana, vide notification dated 01.10.2003, sought to regularize the services of all the ad hoc employees who had completed three years' service as on 30.09.2003 and were still in service. Although, the petitioner fulfilled the criterion in terms of the notification, but owing to a lapse on the part of the clerical staff or for some intangible reason, the necessary entry as regards regularization of his services was not made in his service book. Vide order dated 15.07.2005 (Annexure P6), he was again posted at Municipal Council Yamuna Nagar and that is when he found that services of his colleagues have since been regularized in the year 2003 itself. In fact, one Ramesh son of Sh. Phula Ram, Safai Karamchari, Municipal Corporation Yamuna Nagar, who was initially appointed on 01.12.1998 along with the petitioner, has since been

regularized w.e.f. 01.10.2003. Further, when he took up the matter with the Municipal Corporation Yamuna Nagar-Jagadhri, the Executive Officer of the Corporation, vide letter dated 25.01.2017 (Annexure P7), conveyed the Municipal Committee Indri that services of the petitioner were ought to be regularized w.e.f. 01.10.2003 in terms of the policy of the Government. And since the petitioner was in employment of Municipal Committee Indri during the relevant period, the necessary action was required to be initiated at its end. It is submitted that although a considerable time has elapsed, but the matter continues to await consideration at the end of the respondents. And no result is in sight either.

In conspectus of the above, the petition is disposed of, at this stage, only with a direction to the respondent authority to consider and decide the claim/grievance of the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the receipt of certified copy of this order. And pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. In the event, the claim of the petitioner is declined, the authority shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons in support thereof.

16.01.2018  
Rajan

**( Arun Palli )**  
**Judge**

|                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking / reasoned: | YES |
| Whether Reportable:          | NO  |