

231

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

**COCP No.936 of 2019
Date of Decision: 16.07.2019**

Virender Kumar and another

Petitioners

Versus

Dhanpat Singh, IAS, Financial Commissioner-cum-Principal Secretary,
Transport Department, Haryana and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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 23.08.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.28072 of 2013.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“4. The issue raised in this petition is no longer res integra. It has been decided in several cases including in CWP No.15500 of 2009 (Bir Singh and others vs. The State of Haryana and others decided on 1st October, 2012). The issue is also covered by the decision in CWP No.18714 of 2013 (Jagdish Chand and others vs. State of Haryana and others decided on 18th May, 2016) and three other connected petitions against which the State had gone in LPA No.862 of 2012. The same has been dismissed on 2nd July, 2012. The

Division Bench held that since the services of the respondents in appeal already stood regularized in the years 1987-88, the subsequent policy dated 1st April, 1993, which was a general policy meant to regularize services of ad hoc/contract/work-charge employees of different departments, could not be applied retrospectively to postpone the dates of regularization of the respondents in the appeal and as such the said policy could not adversely affect their conditions of service.”

Learned counsel for the State has filed reply today in the Court appending order dated 08.05.2019 (Annexure R-2). He states that petitioners have been regularized and their monetary benefits, if due, would be released expeditiously.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that no cause of action survives.

The present contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

The rule issued against the respondent is discharged.

The petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies as are available in accordance with law, if aggrieved of order passed by the respondents.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

July 16, 2019

pankaj baweja

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