

469-1

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

**COCP No.2463 of 2018
Date of Decision: 03.12.2019**

Santosh

Petitioner

Versus

Anil Hooda, Chief Conservator of Forest, Haryana and others

Respondents

COCP No.2603 of 2018

Ram Autar

Petitioner

Versus

Anil Hooda, Chief Conservator of Forest, Haryana and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. R.S. Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

These contempt petitions are filed pleading wilful disobedience of judgment dated 17.01.2014 of this Court passed in bunch of writ petitions, main being CWP No.18837 of 2012.

As on date, the only controversy surviving is with regard to date of regularization.

The writ petitions filed by the petitioners challenging the

termination of their services were allowed. It was held that petitioners were entitled to regularization of services from the date when services of employees junior to them were regularized. The competent authority was directed to pass a reasoned order within one month from date of receipt of certified copy of order. The petitioners were held entitled to consequential benefits except payment of arrears prior to filing of the writ petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have not been treated at par with one Shri Bhagwan.

Learned State counsel submits that there is no parity between the case of petitioners and of Shri Bhagwan. However, he fairly submits that there is no reasoned order passed to the said effect.

The petitioners have been regularized, the only issue is of date of regularization. There is substantial compliance of directions of this Court, no interference is called for in the contempt proceedings.

The contempt petitions are disposed of.

However, in order to resolve the surviving controversy, it is desirable that petitioners file a detailed representation within three weeks from today raising their grievances with regard to the date of regularization. In case such representation is made, the respondent shall consider the same in accordance with law after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and shall pass a reasoned

order within 12 weeks of receipt of representation.

In case petitioners are aggrieved of the order passed,
they shall be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

December 03, 2019

pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |