

**Sr. No. 224
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.16367 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.01.2019

Daya Chand

... Petitioner

Versus

Punjab National Bank and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Arjun Attri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate and
Mr. Akash Soni, Advocate,
for the respondents-Bank.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

Mr. Saurav Verma, learned counsel for the respondents points out that the contention of the petitioner that services of the ad hoc employees have been regularized by the respondent-Bank, as noted, in the order dated 02.04.2018, passed by this Court, is factually incorrect.

2. He points out that petitioner was directed by this Court to produce relevant copy of the regularization order, if any, failing which this Court had observed that the petition would be dismissed on that score.

3. He points out that the Bank has not regularized the services of any ad hoc employees as contended by the petitioner.

4. He further submits that in any case an ad hoc employee has no right to claim regularization.

5.
- Be that as it may, without going into the merits of the submissions with regard to the right of ad hoc employee to seek regularization, the present writ petition is dismissed in view of the statement of learned counsel for the respondents that no ad hoc employee has been regularized by the Bank.
6.
- Dismissed accordingly.

10.01.2019

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

vandana

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No