

381

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-774-1997 (O&M)

Date of Decision:03.10.2023

NACHHATAR SINGH AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

V/s.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr. Dilsher S. Mann, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. D.K. Singal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate,
for the private respondents.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this Writ Petition, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of a Writ of *certiorari* for quashing the selection of respondent Nos. 5 to 12 made by respondent No.4 and further give directions to respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to make fresh selections.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners expresses his inability to argue the case as he has no contact with the concerned petitioners.

3. Taking into consideration the fact that this Writ Petition is of the year 1997, this Court deems it appropriate to examine this case on merits.

4. This Court finds that the petitioners have worked temporarily on *ad hoc* basis for 89 days and their services were liable to be terminated on joining of regular candidates. All of them were workmen and the factual aspects of this case should have been raised before the concerned Labour Court, but the same have not been raised. At the same time, the case of

several petitioners have been considered and appointed on regular basis, and the selection process stands completed in terms of the judgment passed by this Court in CWP-12080-1996 and CWP-16911-1996 decided on 16.08.1996.

5. Having noticed the aforesaid facts and the report of the Selection Committee of the Department, this court is satisfied that the regularization process has been conducted after considering the candidature of each and every candidate including the petitioners, and those who have come within the norms of selection have already been regularized while rest are being left out. No right is created in favour of the persons who were appointed on *ad hoc* basis for a short period of 89 days.

6. In view of the observations made hereinabove, no interference of this Court is warranted. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and the same is dismissed accordingly.

7. All pending applications in this Writ Petition shall stand disposed of.

October 3, 2023

Ess Kay

**[SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA]
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>