

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

113

CWP-13621-2020

Decided on : 04.09.2020

Satpal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. S.K. Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Longia, DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Due to the outbreak of pandemic COVID-19, the instant case is being taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing the impugned action of the respondents for not regularizing the services of the petitioner and further by ignoring the fact that the services of his juniors had been regularized under the Policy dated 01.10.2003 (Annexure P-7) in compliance of the judgment and decree passed by Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Rohtak, as well as ignoring the fact that the respondent Department had itself sought details of the employees who were covered under the Policies of 1996 and 2003 vide letter dated 26th February, 2011 (Annexure P-8).

The petitioner is seeking regularization under the Policy dated 01.10.2003 (Annexure P-7). The grievance of the petitioner is that his case was rejected on the ground that he had not completed 240 days, which in fact, was contrary to the information, which had been sought and received by him under the RTI Act, 2005, on 12th March, 2013, as per which, he had, in fact, completed 240 working days. Hence, it has been urged that his case should also have been

considered for regularization as per the aforementioned policy.

Heard.

There is an inordinate delay of more than seven years in filing the instant petition from the date of receipt of information under the RTI Act and no satisfactory explanation about this delay has been brought-forth by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Since the petitioner has woken up from his slumber after seven years, this Court is loathe to grant any indulgence to the petitioner. It need not be emphasized that law leans in favour of those who are alert and vigilant.

Dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 04, 2020

J.Ram

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