

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

CWP-19781-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.09.2022

Poonam Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. V.P. Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing order dated 31.12.2021 (Annexure P-6), whereby contractual services of the petitioner have not been extended.

2. Matter was heard on an earlier occasion and when this Court was not inclined to issue notice, and the following order was passed on 05.09.2022:-

“On a Court query, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks time to verify if any contractual employee in District Panchkula, where the petitioner was serving, has been given preference in extension of contractual period over the petitioner, despite having served for lesser duration on contract vis-à-vis petitioner. Adjourned to 20.09.2022.”

3. *Apropos*, on resumed hearing, the learned State counsel tenders a copy of letter dated 19.09.2022 written by the Director, Fisheries Department, Haryana to the Advocate General, Haryana and the same is taken on record and marked as Annexure ‘A’. In the said letter it is stated that no contractual employee junior to the petitioner in District Panchkula has been re-employed to substitute services of the petitioner.

4. Trite it is to say, that in matters of contract an employee cannot claim to continue in perpetuity or seek re-employment on contract basis without there being any work exigency. Being so, no ground to interfere is made out.

5. Dismissed.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

September 20, 2022

ashish

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No