

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112

CWP No.16615 of 2020
Date of decision: 09.10.2020

Baldev Singh and ors.

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Girish Agnihotri

Present: Mr. Gaagan Pradeep Singh Bal, Advocate for the petitioners.
*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video
conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court).*

GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)

By way of this petition, petitioners-Baldev Singh and 260 others, have sought a writ of certiorari for quashing of order dated 22.06.2018 (Annexure P-10), vide which their claim have been rejected, with a further prayer for issuance of writ of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize their services besides directing the respondents not to dispense with their services.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Ms. Anju Sharma Kaushik, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents-State.

Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* submits that as has been pleaded in para 15 of the writ petition, the buses of PUNBUS later merged in Punjab Roadways. The regular employees in Punjab Roadways are paid over time. In the workshop, mechanics of the buses, who repair the Punjab Roadways buses, also get paid overtime. On the above basis, he

submits that accordingly no distinction could be drawn between the employees of PUNBUS and Punjab Roadways, especially for the drivers and conductors. He further submits that on the same parity, they are also entitled to be considered and regularized. Learned counsel for the petitioners, however, submits that for the same/similar grievances as made in the present petition, the petitioners have submitted a detailed representation dated 14.09.2017 (Annexure P-10), but till date no action has been taken.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners, makes an oral request that considering that the petitioners in the present petition are less educated class, permission be granted to the petitioners to nominate maximum of three lawyers, who may on their behalf attend the hearing to be granted by the Competent Authority for the redressal of their grievances as made in the present writ petition. He submits that the petitioners would like to submit a detailed/supplementary representation also.

An oral request of the learned counsel for the petitioners is accepted.

The Competent Authority is directed to allow maximum of three lawyers on the hearing (hearings) to be granted before deciding the representation (Annexure P-10) and also the supplementary representation that the petitioners would submit within two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

It is desired that the decision in accordance with law, be taken by the Competent Authority i.e. Secretary (Transport), himself or depute/nominate the Competent officer, as expeditiously as possible,

preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The present writ petition is disposed of with the above observation.

(GIRISH AGNIHOTRI)
JUDGE

09.10.2020

jyoti3

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