

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

CWP-17948 of 2015

Date of decision: 15.10.2019

Ajay

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Hayana and others

.... Respondents

CWP-25583 of 2019

Upender

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Hayana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Neeraj Kuamr, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. C.S. Bakhshi, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Babbar Bhan, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. .

By this common order, the above mentioned two writ petitions are being disposed of as both the writ petitions involve same question of law and similar facts.

The grievance which is being raised by the petitioner(s) is that their services have been terminated by the respondent/Co-operative Society, where they were working, in order to make new appointment on similar terms and conditions on which the petitioners were working, which

according to the petitioners, could not have been done keeping in view the settled principle of law. Prayer of the petitioner(s) is that the contractual employees such as petitioners, who were appointed and working satisfactorily cannot be replaced by another set of contractual employees on the same terms and conditions, without there being any valid justification for the same.

Learned counsel for the respondent-Society states that at present, no one is working on the post of data operators i.e the posts on which the petitioners were working as there exists no work of the said post with the society. Counsel for the respondent-Society assures this Court that in case any one is needed to be appointed against the post of data feeding in future, the petitioners will also be considered along with other eligible candidates and in case they are found eligible to discharge the duties of the said post, an appropriate order will be passed.

Keeping in view the statement given by learned counsel for respondent No.3-Society, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he does not wish to press the present writ petition any further and the same may be disposed of as such.

In view thereof, the present writ petition is disposed of as having been not pressed. Respondent No.3 will be bound by the statement as recorded above.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

15.10.2019.

aarti 1. Whether speaking/non-speaking?

Yes/No

2. Whether reportable?

Yes/No