

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Writ Petition No. 23844 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.01.2023

Kajal Verma and Others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Mohit Jaggi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. D.K.Singal, Additional Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent No.1 to 3.

Mr. Saurabh Chawla, Advocate
for Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Advocate
for the respondent No.4.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. The petitioners pray for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the communication issued by the office of the Director Principal, Government Medical College, Patiala, on 27.09.2022.

2. The relevant facts, in brief, are required to be noticed. During the prevalence of COVID-19 pandemic, the services of the petitioners were engaged on temporary basis through outsource agencies. The petitioners claim that certain other similarly engaged Research Scientists, Research Assistants, Lab Technicians and Data Entry Operators have been allowed to continue, whereas, the petitioners have not been given the similar treatment.

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioners contends that a

Faridkot, which included the names of the petitioners, however, in the final list with respect to deployment of manpower, their names have been omitted.

4. It is not in dispute that the petitioners were engaged by Scientific Security Management Services Private Limited, E-1, Mansarovar Garden, New Delhi and M/s Sharma Enterprises (Regd.), 92-B, Flat No. 1, Ground Floor, Nawada, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi. Though the petitioners may have worked during the tough times, however, in the absence of any right to continue, the petitioners are not entitled to the issuance of a writ. On a careful reading of the order dated 27.09.2022, it is evident that an extension for a period of one month was given to the petitioners. The learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that the other officials are being allowed to work. Once the petitioners were engaged by the outsource agencies on temporary basis, this Court does not consider it appropriate to issue the writ, as prayed for.

5. Hence, the present writ petition is dismissed.

6. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

January 24, 2023
“DK”

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