

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

214

**RSA-146-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision:09.02.2018**

Madan Lal

.... Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rohit Arya, AAG, Haryana.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (ORAL)

In the instant appeal, appellant's grievance is two fold. One is oral termination and another is regularization. He was appointed on 01.03.1999 as a daily-wager. His services were dispensed on 26.03.2000. Till 27.05.2005 appellant did not raise issue relating to dispensing his services with reference to order dated 26.03.2000. On the other hand, he was pursuing the regularization of his services on par with similarly situated persons whose services have been continued. As long as order of oral termination is not challenged timely question of regularization do not arise. Unless and until oral termination is held to be bad then only he is entitled to claim regularization, if any. Even for the purpose of regularization appellant is out of service from 26.03.2000. Even though he had filed CWP No. 2979 of 2001 which was disposed of on 01.03.2001. Appellant should have brought into the notice of this court that his services have been dispensed on 26.03.2000. In the absence of not disclosing the dispensing his services and

further seeking quashing of oral termination before appropriate forum
appellant is not entitled to either reinstatement or regularization. Thus,
appellant has not made out. Appeal stands dismissed.

09.02.2018
pooja saini

(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasons	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No