

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

(221)

CWP-3128-2019

Date of Decision : November 09, 2022

Kalu Ram

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Maan, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present petition, the genuine claim of the petitioner for giving the benefit of period from April, 1997 to 22.07.2004 has not been given and the respondents are liable to regularize the service of the petitioner in the cadre of S.S. Master w.e.f. 01.10.2003.

After notice of motion, the respondents have filed the reply wherein, the respondents have stated that the petitioner was initially appointed as S.S. Master on contract basis on 22.01.1997 for a period of 89 days and after the expiry of the said period, the petitioner was relieved and thereafter, keeping in view the claim being raised by the petitioner in CWP No.7782 of 2004, the petitioner was again given an appointment on

contract basis on 20.07.2004. As per the respondents, the said appointment order depicted that no benefit of the earlier service will be given including any financial benefits. Thereafter, the petitioner while working on contract basis, competed for regular selection in the year 2006 and was selected and ultimately appointed as Science Master on regular basis through direct recruitment on 29.12.2008 and therefore, the claim of the petitioner for granting him benefit for the period from 1997 till 2004 does not arise.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has the example of certain candidates, who are similarly situated as the petitioner and have been granted the benefits.

Learned State counsel submits that in case the petitioner has orders of similarly situated persons, having been granted the benefit as being claimed in the present petition, if produced before the authorities concerned by way of representation, the same will be considered in accordance with law and appropriate order will be passed within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of any such grievance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the above, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to approach the respondents.

Ordered accordingly.

November 09, 2022
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No