

CWP No. 1070 of 2012

Date of Decision: 30.08.2022

Raj Pal Kaur and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Board and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.Mr. Vijay Kumar Kaushal, Advocate,
for respondents no. 1 and 2.

Mr. Teevar Sharma, A.A.G. Punjab.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have challenged the orders dated 29.04.2010 and 20.05.2010, whereby the case of the petitioners for regularization from a prior date has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners had been appointed as *ad hoc* clerks in the year 1986-87 and the private respondents who had joined after the petitioners had been regularized w.e.f. 31.12.1990. The petitioners ought to have been regularized w.e.f. 1990, the date when their juniors had been regularized.

Learned counsel for the respondents while referring to the written statement submits that the private respondents had cleared the type test prior to 11.01.1995 and they were regularized after relaxation of the educational qualification.

The petitioners had cleared the type test much later and therefore they had been regularised w.e.f. 27.11.2003. The essential qualification for appointment as clerk was matriculation with first division but the same had been relaxed in the case of the petitioners and respondents after they had cleared the typing test in English and Punjabi.

Heard.

The petitioners had been appointed as *ad hoc* clerks in the year 1986-87. The one of the essential qualifications for the post of clerk is proficiency in English and Punjabi typing. The respondents had cleared the typing test ahead of the petitioners and therefore they had been regularized from a prior date. The petitioners had been regularized w.e.f. 27.11.2003 but the instant petition has been preferred after nearly a decade in the year 2012 seeking regularization from a prior date.

Therefore, as the private respondents had cleared the typing test prior to the petitioners, I do not find any infirmity in the official respondents regularizing the private respondents prior to the regularization of the petitioners.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

August 30, 2022
nitin

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No