

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Writ Petition No. 8949 of 2023

Date of Decision: 28.04.2023

Varinder Singh and Others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Punjab and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. It was way back in the year 2006, a Five Judges Bench of the Supreme Court in *Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others vs. Uma Devi and Others (2006) 4 SCC 1* held that the directions to regularize the services of the back door entrants is not in consonance with the Constitutional scheme. As a one time relaxation, the Court permitted the States to frame a policy to regularize the services of the temporary employees who had already completed the ten years of their services on the date of judgment. The petitioner was employed after 2010. Moreover, similar instructions issued by the State of Haryana have been quashed by a Division Bench of this Court in *Yogesh Tyagi and Another v. State of Haryana and Others (Civil Writ Petition No. 17206 of 2014, decided on 31.05.2018.*

Civil Writ Petition No. 8866 of 2023

pendency of certain writ petitions wherein the interim orders have been passed. This Court has considered the submissions of the learned counsel representing the parties.

3. Once the law enunciated by the five Judges Bench is categoric, this Court is bound to follow the law laid down by a larger Bench. Hence, pendency of the various writ petitions cannot be made the ground to keep the writ petition pending.

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

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

April 28, 2023
“DK”

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