

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

**CWP No. 17949 of 2021
Date of decision: 10.09.2021**

Hari Om and others	versus	...Petitioners
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. S. P. Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners have approached this Court seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of impugned order along with list of 306 candidates (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2, vide which the vacant posts of Gram Sachivs would be filled up under outsourcing Policy Part-I of the Government from the retired Gram Sachivs or erstwhile Gram Vikas Sahayak till the regular appointments are made by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission. Further prayer of the petitioners is that the respondents be directed to consider the petitioners against the regular posts of the Gram Sachivs under Part-II of the Outsourcing Policy.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that posts of Gram Vikas Sahayak were created by the State of Haryana in 2003. About 1884 Gram Vikas Sahayak were then appointed. Due to change of Government, those posts were abolished. Aggrieved against the same, petitioners filed various writ petitions which were dismissed upto Appellate Court. The

petitioners approached the concerned authorities to take a sympathetic view but in vain. Hence, the present petition.

3. On advance service, learned State counsel appearing for the respondents submits that admittedly the petitioners have already issued a legal notice dated 09.08.2021 (Annexure P-8) and even before the same is considered by the competent authority, they have rushed to this Court to file the instant writ petition. He further submits that whatever the merits of the case, the same would be considered by the competent authority and appropriate orders would be passed. In case, the petitioners are found deserving, as is claimed by them in this writ petition, the competent authority will look into the same, in accordance with law.

4. In the premise, no grounds to interfere at this stage are made out. However, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to follow up their claim with the competent authority who shall look into their grievance, in accordance with law.

10.09.2021
Shalini/vs

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No