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

107**CWP-4716-2022**

Date of decision : 12.05.2022

Sonu and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Sube Singh Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have challenged the order dated 08.11.2021 (Annexure P-9) whereby their claim for direct employment with the Bank without outsourcing agency has been rejected. They have also sought further direction for re-employment on contractual basis.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners had been working with the respondent/Bank and they had fraudulently been appointed through an outsourcing agency. They were the employees of the Bank as surety bonds were obtained by the Bank at the time of the petitioners' employment.

Heard.

It is manifest that the petitioners had been appointed as Clerks and Peons through outsourcing agency-respondent No.7 and were being paid by respondent No.7. It is true that the surety bonds were obtained by the respondent/Bank but the same would not change the nature of employment.

A surety bond is used as a document of assurance to certify the antecedents of an employee who is to work in the Bank.

It is settled law that no writ petition would lie against an outsourcing agency, insofar as it is not an authority in terms of Article 12 of the Constitution of India. Reference can be made to the judgment of a Division Bench of this court in the case of **Nishan Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others, 2014(11) RCR (Civil) 262**, wherein it has been held that, the service provider who has selected the candidates for work in the government department, is not an agency of the State. The appellants therein were neither selected under any service rules applicable to regular employees of the State of Punjab nor did they apply under any advertisement for their appointment as contractual or regular employees of the state. It was further held that the acceptance of the claim of the appellants therein for continuation of services would amount to a back door entry to public employment in total disregard to the mandate of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Anmol Garg and another versus State of Punjab and others**, bearing CWP No.29655 of 2018, decided on 28.11.2018, a Coordinate Bench of this Court dismissed the writ petition preferred by an employee engaged through outsourcing agency which was upheld by a Division Bench in LPA No.1910 of 2018, decided on 10.12.2018 and the operative part thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“Learned Single Judge finding that the appellant was an employee of outsourcing agency which was having a license under the contract to supply manpower held there was no privity of contract between the appellant and the employer and she was not even a contractual employee. The principle being canvassed before us

applies only in case there is a privity of contract between the employee and the employer. In the case in hand, the appellant was an employee of the service provider. The benefit of the said principle is not liable to be extended to her and, thus, we do not find any illegality committed by learned Single Judge in dismissing the writ petition.”

Reference can also be made to the orders of the Coordinate Benches of this Court in the cases of '**Vikas versus The State of Haryana and others**' bearing CWP No.19762 of 2018, decided on 11.12.2019, '**Kailash Chand and others versus Urban Local Bodies Department, Haryana and others**', bearing CWP No.21345 of 2021, decided on 18.01.2022 and '**Naresh Kumar and others versus Haryana State Warehousing Corporation and others**', bearing CWP No.17454 of 2020, decided on 02.12.2020, wherein similar petitions of outsourcing employees were also dismissed.

In view of the above, I do not find any merit in this petition, especially when the petitioners were employed through outsourcing agency and were also being paid salary through the outsourcing agency.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

However, this order shall not preclude the petitioners from seeking recourse to alternative remedy available to them under the law.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

May 12, 2022
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No