

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

(216)

CWP-5582-2016

Date of Decision: August 29, 2019

Brahm Parkash & ors

.. Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. R.K. Malik, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanjit Singh Bakhshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Diwan S. Adlakha, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(ORAL)

In the present writ petition, the grievance which is being raised by the petitioners is that the petitioners are working on contract basis under *Swachh Bharat Mission* in District Jhajjar. The details of their appointment have been given in paragraph 2 of the writ petition, which shows that the petitioners are working since the year 2007 onwards. Respondents-State of Haryana had issued an advertisement on 16.03.2016 advertising the post on which the petitioners were working, to be filled on contract basis for a period of one year.

As the petitioners were sought to be replaced by the Government of Haryana by another set of contract employees, petitioners have filed the present writ petition challenging the advertisement by which the post on which the petitioners were working, was sought to be filled up again on contract basis and that too for a period of one year.

Notice of motion was issued and interim order was granted on 22.03.2016. On the strength of the said interim order, the petitioners are still continuing in service.

Learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, states that advertisement Annexure P-1 already stands withdrawn and there is no intention of the State to replace the petitioners by another set of contract employees but in case any post on which the petitioners are working, has either been abolished or the service of any petitioner is no longer required, appropriate procedure will be followed for dispensing their services but under no circumstances, they will be replaced with another set of employees on the same terms and conditions in which petitioners are working.

Keeping in view the above statement, which has been given on behalf of the respondent No.2, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners states that the petitioners do not want to press this writ petition any further as the same has been rendered infructuous.

In view of the above, the present writ petition is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

August 29, 2019
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No