

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

102

**CWP-1266-2021(O&M)
Date of Order:19.01.2021**

**HARYANA STATE RURAL LIVELIHOODS MISSION
EMPLOYEES WELFARE ASSOCIATION**

..Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Amardeep Hooda, Advocate,
for the petitioner-Association.

Mr. Samarth Sagar, Addl. A.G.,Haryana

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The hearing of the case was held through video conferencing on account of restricted functioning of the Courts.

The petitioner before this Court is a welfare association of the employees. The petitioner-association have challenged a policy decision taken by the State Government to manage and execute the schemes name Shyama Prasad Mukherjee Rurban Mission and National Rural Livelihood Mission and allied services through the Chief Executive Officers of DRDAs/Zila Parishad for better co-ordination and effective implementation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner-association contends that previously at the district level, such missions were being managed through Additional Deputy Commissioner. However, now the Government has taken a decision to hand over the implementation to the officials noted above.

Learned counsel for the petitioner-association contends that such action is against the by-laws of the society.

It may be noted here that Haryana State Rural Livelihood Mission is a Society registered under the Haryana Registration and Regulation of Societies Act, 2012. The Society gets funds from the Central Government for running various schemes. In order to run the schemes effectively, the Government has taken a policy decision. Still further, the Society has not objected to the decision taken. The Employees Association has filed this petition. The power of judicial review in the policy decision of the Government is limited. In the absence of violation of any statutory provision or the decision being shown to be arbitrary, the Court should be reluctant to interfere. Further, learned counsel for the petitioner-association has failed to draw the attention of the court to the alleged violation of by-laws of the Society.

Hence, no ground to issue a writ, as prayed for.

Dismissed.

January 19, 2021
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No