

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**

**Civil Writ Petition No. 5926 of 2020**

**Date of Decision: 10.01.2023**

Hira Lal and Another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.**

Present: Mr.Jagjit Singh Gill and Mr. Aarish Kamboj, Advocates  
for Mr. Ashok Kumar Sama, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Assistant Advocate General,  
Punjab, for the respondents.

**Anil Kshetarpal, J.**

1. This writ petition has been filed by the two petitioners with a prayer to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus to regularize their services on the post of Pump Operators (Junior Technicians) in view of the policy dated 18.03.2011, issued by the Government of Punjab.

2. In response to the writ petition, the respondents have filed the written statement. Para 4 thereof reads as under:-

*“4. That the petitioner Hira Lal was originally engaged as a daily wager Pump Operator on 01.12.1982, but he absented himself from duty from 31.10.1984 onwards. He however came and started working as a Daily Wager Pump Operator w.e.f. 01.10.1997 i.e. after a gap of about 13 years. Similarly, the second petitioner Madan Lal was also engaged as a Daily*

*Wager Pump Operator on 01.03.1986. He also absented himself from duty after 31.01.1987. He too came and started working as a Daily Wager Pump Operator w.e.f. 01.10.1997 i.e. after a gap of more than 10 years.”*

3. It has further been stated that the petitioners are not fulfilling the requirements of the State Regularization Policy dated 18.03.2011 as they did not complete ten years of service upto December, 2006. The learned counsel representing the petitioner, though, made sincere attempts, however, failed to put forth any convincing argument to prove that the petitioners fulfill the requirements of the policy.

4. Moreover, *Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others vs. Uma Devi and Others (2006) 4 SCC 1*, a five Judge bench of the Supreme Court has already declared that the Courts should be slow in issuing the writ of mandamus to direct the regularization of services of the employees.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground is made out to issue a writ. Hence, the present writ petition is dismissed.

**(Anil Kshetarpal)**  
**Judge**

**January 10, 2023**  
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No