

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

**CWP-6144-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision : 05.04.2021**

Vijay Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Harlove Singh Rajput, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner w.e.f. January 1997 in terms of the Policy dated 01.10.2003 (Annexure P-13).

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is fully eligible for regularization of services under the Policy dated 01.10.2003 (Annexure P-13) and further that other employees, similarly situated as the petitioner, have already been granted the benefit of the said policy and their services have been regularized.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would further contend that in this regard, a representation dated 25.02.2021 (Annexure P-1) has been sent to respondent No.1, however, no action/decision has been taken qua the same. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further contend that, at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to respondents Nos.1 to 3 to take a decision on the representation dated 25.02.2021 (Annexure P-1) by passing a speaking order keeping in mind the order dated

11.12.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.24542 of 2018 and order dated 04.07.2018 passed in CWP No.15887 of 2018, in a time-bound manner.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana, who has joined the session through video conferencing, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3-State. The remaining respondent Nos.4 to 8 are proforma respondents and, on request of learned counsel for the petitioner, issuance of notices to them is dispensed with.

Learned State counsel contends that the representation has been sent to respondent No.1, however, the appropriate authority is respondent No.3-Executive Engineer, Construction Division, HR. PWD B&R, Chandigarh.

Heard.

In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, without commenting on the merits of the case or the claim made by the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed off with a direction to respondent No.3-Executive Engineer, Construction Division, HR. PWD B&R, Chandigarh to treat the present writ petition as a representation and take a decision thereon by passing a speaking order keeping in mind the order dated 11.12.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.24542 of 2018 and order dated 04.07.2018 passed in CWP No.15887 of 2018, in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Disposed off, accordingly.

05.04.2021
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO