

106

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

CWP No.21941 of 2020  
Date of decision: 18.12.2020

**Satbir Singh**

**..... Petitioner (s)**

**V/s.**

**State of Haryana and others**

**..... Respondent (s)**

**CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR**

Present: Mr. Vikram Sheoran, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**Sanjay Kumar, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner assails the order dated 01.10.2020 passed by the Managing Director of Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Limited, Panchkula, the second respondent herein. He seeks a further direction to regularize his services as per the Policy dated 27.05.1993, on par with certain similarly situated employees named by him.

The petitioner entered the service of the second respondent-Corporation on 01.01.1987 as a Mali on daily wage basis. He was regularized in service with effect from 06.10.1995, pursuant to the order dated 17.09.2015 passed by this Court in CWP No.25963 of 2012. This

order required the second respondent-Cooperation to regularize the petitioner's services with effect from the date his junior was regularized, *vide* order dated 06.10.1995.

Thereafter, the petitioner filed CWP No.9071 of 2020 claiming that he had addressed Legal Notice dated 11.12.2019 to the second respondent-Corporation seeking regularization of his services with effect from 01.04.1993. The said writ petition was disposed of on 02.07.2020 directing the second respondent-Corporation to take a decision on his legal notice. Pursuant to this order, the impugned order dated 01.10.2020 came to be passed rejecting his request.

The aforestated facts demonstrate that the petitioner himself sought regularization of his services from the date his junior was regularized, *vide* order dated 06.10.1995. Accordingly, the second respondent-Corporation regularized his services with effect from that date.

That being so, it would not be open to the petitioner to seek to re-open the issue by claiming that he was not aware of what was done by the second respondent-Corporation in relation to some other employees and therefore, he should be given that benefit now. Having chosen to file the earlier writ petition in 2012 with a particular prayer, based on the facts gathered by him, the petitioner cannot now state that he has gathered some more facts and claim that the entire issue requires to be re-examined. If such a plea is to be accepted, there would be no end to this litigation.

The prayer of the petitioner for regularization of his services from an earlier date therefore cannot be accepted. The impugned order dated 01.10.2020, rejecting such claim, does not brook interference.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

No order as to costs.

18.12.2020  
rakesh

(SANJAY KUMAR)  
JUDGE

|                    |   |        |
|--------------------|---|--------|
| whether speaking   | : | Yes/no |
| whether reportable | : | Yes/no |