

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

**CWP No.9290 of 2001(O&M)
Date of decision: 26.05.2022**

Satpal

...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 in accordance with the issued Govt. of Haryana instructions dated 27.05.1993 (Annexure P-1).

2. Petition was noticed on 05.07.2001.

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 No.2 of the preliminary objections of the written statement filed on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4, which is reproduced herein below for ready reference:-

“2. That, as a matter of fact, the petitioner has never worked with the answering respondent; hence the question of regularization does not arise. So far as the issues of instruction by the Govt. for regularization are concerned the same are admitted. However, if the petitioner has worked with the respondents since 1984 then he should have represented to authorities during the year 1993 when the instructions were issued. But he kept mum upto 2001 when he filed CWP No.47 of 2001. This proves that he is not approaching the Court with clean hands. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches alone, apart from on merit, in view of the submissions made above.

5. 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.

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

7. Dismissed.

26.05.2022
hemlata

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No