

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

CWP-23336 of 2016

Date of decision: 16.09.2019

Rishi Pal

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Inder Pal Goyat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Rajesh K, Sheoran, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.

The grievance which is being raised in the present writ petition is that the service of the petitioner was not being regularised by the respondents as Fitter Helper, though, the persons, who were junior to him have already been regularised by the respondents.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that the date of appointment of the petitioner was 02.04.1991 whereas, the junior persons, whose details have been annexed with the writ petition as Annexure P/2 were regularised in the years starting from 2006 till 2009. Counsel further argues that during the pendency of the present writ petition, the respondents have passed order dated 20.01.2018, by which, the service of the petitioner has been regularised as Fitter Helper but with prospective effect and not from the date, when his juniors were brought on regular service.

Counsel for the petitioner prays that the petitioner be given liberty to approach the respondents by filing an appropriate representation by giving details of the juniors, whose services have been regularised starting from year 2007 onwards, from which date, the petitioner is entitled for regularisation of his service as a Fitter Helper and respondents be directed to decide the said representation in accordance with law in a time bound manner.

Counsel for respondents No.2 to 4 states that in case any representation is filed by the petitioner, claiming regularisation with retrospective effect by giving details of the persons, who were junior to him and were regularised from a date earlier than that of petitioner, his case will also be considered and appropriate order will be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of representation/request of the petitioner and in case the request of the petitioner is found to be genuine, the benefit will also be extended to him.

Keeping in view the statement made by counsel for the respondents No.2 to 4, counsel for the petitioner does not intend to press the present writ petition any further and prays that same be disposed of as such.

Present writ petition stands disposed of as having been not pressed. However, respondents will be bound by their statement as recorded above.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

16.09.2019
aarti

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/non-speaking? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |