

Sr. No.678

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
CWP-13483-2000 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.05.2022

Sukhbir Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. R.D.Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner as per the policy dated 07.03.1996 and 18.03.1996 issued by State of Haryana.

2. Petition was admitted on 22.01.2002.

3. When called out for hearing, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It seems that by sheer effluxion of time and pendency of the writ petition for more than 21 years before this Court, either it has been rendered infructuous or even otherwise the petitioner seems to have lost interest in pursuing the same.

4. In any case, it appears that even on merits, claim of the petitioner is not admissible in view of the following stand taken in para 2 of the preliminary objections and para 4 and 5 of the reply on merits, which are reproduced herein below for ready reference:-

“2 *That the present writ petition has been filed without considering the instructions issued by the Govt. The workman has already left the work w.e.f. 21.5.2000 with his own and he did not turn up at work till date. So this writ petition is not maintainable on this ground.*”

XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

“4 &5 *As per Haryana Government Policy letter no. 6/38/95-2GSI dated 7.3.96 and amended letter dated 18.3.96 only those daily wages workers are entitled for regularisation who have completed 3 years services on 31.1.96 and were in service on 31.1.96 provided that they have worked for a minimum period of 240 days in each year and break in service in any year should not be more than one month at time.*”

5. Learned State counsel has canvassed arguments on the similar lines as the stand taken in the aforesaid written statement.

6. I am in agreement with the stand taken by the respondents as aforesaid. Neither any replication has been filed to the afore noted stand of the respondents nor any additional affidavit of any kind to controvert the same.

7. In view of the aforesaid, no grounds are made out to interfere.

8. Dismissed.

24.05.2022
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No