

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CWP-488-2018****Date of Decision: 11.09.2019**

Ranjit Singh

.. Petitioner**vs.**

Oriental Bank of Commerce and Another

.. Respondents**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

Present : Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. R.N.Lohan, Advocate, for the respondents.

ARUN MONGA, J.

Limited grievance of the petitioner, herein, is that his representations dated 31.03.2017 and 15.09.2017 (Annexures P-3 and P-4), respectively, be directed to be considered by the respondent(s)-Bank and a consequential direction be also issued for regularization of his services on the post of Peon.

2. Petitioner claims to be working as Peon in the Branch, office of Oriental Bank of Commerce at Abohar since the year 2009 and he is a matriculate and being eligible, seeks regularization of his services.

3. In the return filed by the respondent(s)-Bank, pointed stand has been taken that petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands and has misled this Court in issuance of notice on petition. It is stated that the petitioner is neither currently working in the respondent(s)-Bank nor was he ever appointed as a Peon. The petitioner has, thus, wrongly stated on oath that he is working as Peon in the Bank.

4. It is further stated that, in fact, it was the mother of the petitioner Smt. Parkash Kaur, who was working as Head Peon in the Branch, office of respondent-Bank at Abohar and she retired on 30.04.2015.

5. Neither any replication has been filed to controvert the contents of the return filed by the respondent-Bank nor any worthwhile arguments have been addressed in course of hearing to establish the locus standi of the petitioner.

6. Having heard the rival contentions and after perusal of the pleadings alongwith relevant record, I am of the view that no interference is called for by this Court in extraordinary writ jurisdiction vested under Article 226 of Constitution of India. Writ petition being devoid of merit, deserves to be dismissed.

7. The contention of learned counsel for the respondents that the petitioner has misled this Court, seems to be correct as there is nothing on record to show as to how petitioner claims to be in employment of the respondent(s)-Bank, other than, merely deposing by way of supporting affidavit filed alongwith the writ petition. It is incomprehensible that on one hand, petitioner claims to be working since 2009 and yet, neither any appointment letter nor any proof of payment of wages nor even otherwise, any proof of identity issued by the Bank or any other worthwhile document to establish that he is in employment of the Bank, has been placed on record.

8. In the aforesaid premise, writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to pursue his cause by way of an alternate remedy, if so advised, provided, of course, he is able to establish that he is in service of the Bank.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

11.09.2019
smriti

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