

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(206)

CWP No. 16258 of 2015
Date of Decision : 21.08.2023

Mahabir Parshad and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the question of law as to whether, the daily wage/ad-hoc service rendered prior to the regularization of services of an employee is to be treated as a qualifying service for computing the pensionary benefits, is covered by the decision in ***Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and others Vs. Bachan Singh, 2009(5) SLR 476***, hence, the said benefit be extended to the petitioners and the present petition be disposed of in the same terms and conditions.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents has not been able to rebut the fact that the claim of the petitioners is only for counting the work charge service rendered prior to the regularization of their services, which question of law already stands settled in ***Bachan Singh's case (supra)***.

3. Keeping in view the above, the present petition is disposed of in same terms and conditions as in *Bachan Singh’s case (supra)*.

August 21, 2023
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No