

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

**LPA No.1253 of 2018(O&M)
Date of decision: 10.09.2018**

Kulbhushan and others

... Appellants

Versus

Water & Sanitation Support Organization, Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE**

Present: Mr. Sunil Hooda, Advocate for
Mr. Samrat Malik, Advocate for the appellants.
Mr. Sharad Aggarwal, AAG, Haryana.

KRISHNA MURARI, C.J. (Oral)

This appeal under Clause X of the Letters Patent is filed by the petitioners/appellants challenging the order dated 01.08.2018 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition was admitted but the ex parte interim order granted at the time of motion has been vacated.

Petitioners approached this Court alleging that they were appointed as Block Resource Coordinators on contract basis at a fixed monthly remuneration of ₹ 15,000/- to render services as per the guidelines for implementation of National Rural Drinking Water Programme – a scheme being run by the Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Drinking Water & Sanitation, Government of India, through State of Haryana. The scheme was being run by the State of Haryana through a registered Society by the name of Water & Sanitation Support Organization,

Haryana. The Union of India raised an objection with respect to payment of ₹ 15,000/- per month to the Coordinators, which was against the prescribed guidelines of payment of ₹ 5,000/- per month. It was only after the objection, the respondent-Society took a decision to discontinue the services of the petitioners and to engage the said Coordinators through outsourcing agency/NGO, as per the guidelines. The petitioners-appellants were at liberty to apply for engagement through the said outsourcing agency/NGO.

Learned Single Judge finding that there has been a shift in the policy of engagement, vacated the stay order. Admittedly, since then a month has passed and the petitioners' engagement has already come to an end. In these circumstances, we deem it fit that the writ petition filed by the appellants itself may be decided on merits at the earliest.

Considering the above, we dispose of the appeal with a direction that the writ petition itself may be heard and disposed of expeditiously. The registry is directed to place the writ petition for hearing before the learned Single Judge according to the roster on 26.09.2018 with a request to the learned Single Judge to dispose of the writ petition either on the same day or as expeditiously as possible.

(Krishna Murari)
Chief Justice

(Arun Palli)
Judge

10.09.2018
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO