

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
103

**CM Nos. 1610 & 1611-LPA of 2020 in/and
LPA No. 596 of 2020
Date of Decision: 14th September, 2020**

Jagdish RaiAppellant

VERSUS

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

**CORAM: JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the Applicant/Appellant.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
for the official Respondents.

Dr. S. Muralidhar, J.

CM-1610-LPA-2020 (Delay)

1. For the reasons stated therein, the application is allowed and the delay of 2 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CM-1611-LPA of 2020

2. This is an application for placing on record a document annexed as Annexure A-1 to the present application.

3. For the reasons stated therein, the application is allowed and the document is taken on record.

LPA-596-2020

4. This appeal is directed against the order dated 12th February, 2020 passed by learned Single Judge, dismissing CWP No. 3700 of 2020, whereby the Appellant had challenged the engagement/re-appointment of the private

Respondents, which according to the Appellant/Petitioner was in violation of the policy dated 2nd February, 2016 and a notification dated 6th June, 2012.

5. The learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petition essentially on the ground that it was barred by laches. The appointments that the Appellant/Petitioner was questioning were made in the year 2105, whereas the writ petition was filed in 2020.

6. In seeking to explain the delay, Mr. Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj, learned Counsel for the Appellant points out that on an earlier complaint by him made in December, 2017, enquiries were made into the legality of the appointments and there was also a report submitted supporting his contention.

7. The Court finds that the aforesaid enquiry is still in progress and a notice has been issued to the Petitioner as recently as 11th August, 2020 to appear and assist in the enquiry.

8. In the circumstances the Court sees no reason why the Appellant should have during the pendency of the enquiry, approached the High Court for redress.

9. The appeal is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

(S. MURALIDHAR)
JUDGE

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

14th September, 2020
jk

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No