

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

101

**CWP-25676 of 2012 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.02.2023**

Rajinder Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CWP-25848 of 2012 (O&M)

Harbinder Kumar

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Rai Singh Chauhan, Advocate,
Mr. Rohit Sapehiya, Advocate and
Ms. Deepika Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Sunil Agnihotri, Advocate
for respondent no.4.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

1. Two connected writ petitions filed by the petitioners, who were appointed on a contract basis have come up for final disposal.
2. The services of the petitioners in both the writ petitions have been dispensed with in terms of the said contract. The respondents while terminating the services of the petitioners have observed that due to lack of the budget, the petitioners are being relieved by the department. These writ petitions have been filed to challenge the correctness of the relieving orders thereof.

3. The services of the petitioners were dispensed with on 30.11.2012. At that point in time, they were working as the Guest Faculty Lecturers in the Industrial Training Institute, Talwara. They claim discrimination *vis-a-vis* respondent no.4, who was retained in service though appointed along with the petitioners. The respondents have stated that respondent no.4 was selected by the Departmental Selection Committee in Industrial Training Institute, Ludhiana, whereas the petitioners were appointed by the Principal of the Industrial Training Institute under the scheme for up-gradation of 500 Industrial Training Institutes with the aid of the World Bank and the Central Government.

4. This court has considered the submissions of the learned counsels representing the parties.

5. It is not in dispute that the services of the petitioners have been dispensed with in accordance with their terms of the contract. Hence, they cannot claim right to continue in the employment. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment passed in *State of Maharashtra vs. Anita and others, (2016) 8 SCC 293*.

6. Hence, no ground is made out to issue the writ as prayed for.

7. Dismissed.

8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

February 27, 2023
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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