

219

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

**COC P No.801 of 2019
Date of Decision: 16.07.2019**

Ved Parkash

Petitioner

Versus

Jitender Goswami, Superintending Engineer SYL Water Services,
Ambala and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Balbir Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jangra, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 22.01.2019 passed by this Court in CWP No.11745 of 2018.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“As far as the claim of three petitioners who were Clerks is concerned, writ petition is being dismissed. Keeping in view that one contractual employee has been appointed after relieving petitioner No. 4, this petition is being partly allowed qua him and respondents will immediately relieve Baljit Singh and re-appoint petitioner No. 4. With regard to the relieving of petitioner No. 5, respondents have not appointed anybody, writ petition is being dismissed qua her. However, it has been observed that in future if the appointment on contract basis is made through outsourcing policy,

preference will be given to the petitioners as they have been working with the Department without any complaint since 2013. The petitioners can approach this Court for review of this order in case any appointment is made on contract basis for the post of Clerk and Peon.”

Learned counsel for the State has filed reply of Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Executive Engineer, Irrigation and Water Resources Department, Panchkula, same is taken on record. Copy of reply is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the reply, it has been stated that petitioner No.4 (in the writ petition) has been re-appointed by relieving Baljit Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that grievance still survives as re-appointment is not as per terms and conditions.

The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is not part of the present contempt petition as direction of the Court was to appoint the petitioner in place of Baljit Singh.

The present contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

The rule issued against the respondent is discharged.

However, petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies as are available in accordance with law.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

July 16, 2019

pankaj baweja

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