

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

CWP-22130-2020(O&M)

Date of decision: 23.12.2020

Sunil Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr.G.S.Kaura, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. B.B.Sharma, Advocate for respondent no. 1 and 2

Mr. Rajiv Joshi, Advocate for respondent no.3

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners were engaged as Apprentices, for a period of one year, under the Apprentice Act, 1961 by the State Bank of India. After expiry of the period, the petitioners have been relieved.

The petitioners claim that the Bank has again issued an advertisement inviting applications for appointment of fresh apprentices. He submits that the petitioners were promised that they will be absorbed against regular posts. He submits that in the welcome speech, the Chief Manager, of the Bank, had made promise.

The object of engaging apprentices is to impart them training and prepare them for the future employment. However, engagement as apprentice does not confer any right for absorption against regular posts.

On a court question, learned counsel, for the petitioner,

very fairly admitted that there is no provision under the Apprentice Act, 1961 conferring any right of absorption. In the public notice/recruitment notice, it was specified that the time of training shall be for a period of 1 year only. The petitioners are seeking a writ in the nature of Mandamus, to direct the Bank, to continue to employ the petitioners. In the absence of any right and the corresponding duty on the respondents, no writ can be issued.

Hence, dismissed.

23.12.2020
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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