

Sr. No.681

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
CWP-13797-2000 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.05.2022

Ravi Parkash

...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 certiorari to quash the impugned order dated 21.02.2000 (Annexure P-9) vide which claim of the petitioner for regular appointment was rejected.

2. Petition was admitted on 10.02.2003.

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 1 of the preliminary objections, which is reproduced herein below for ready reference:-

“1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for the issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the order dated 21.02.2000, Annexure P/9 vide which the claim of the petitioner for regularisation of his service was rejected. It is submitted in this context that the petitioner has already been appointed as P.T.I. on adhoc basis just like his four seniors (Merit No. 17 to 20 in the List of District Rewari in which the name of the petitioner appeared at Serial No. 21. The respondent No. 2 is not competent to appoint a person on regular basis when the post of a particular category does not

exist. The posts are created by govt. with the approval of Finance Department ad policy in this regard has been framed after 07.03.1996. The petitioner is not covered under the policy as he joined service on adhoc capacity on 11.8.1999.”

5. Learned State counsel has canvassed arguments on the similar lines as the stand taken in the aforesaid written statement. He submits that age of the petitioner is 68 years as of now.

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.
Dismissed.

24.05.2022
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No