

CWP-2260-2024 and
other connected cases

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

267-3 cases

CWP-2260-2024
Date of decision:12.11.2024

Janga alias Jagir and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Debo Devi

CWP-15958-2024

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Bhim Singh

CWP-27964-2024

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Rajat Ahlawat and Mr. DPS Bajwa, Advocates
for the petitioners in CWP-2260-2024 and CWP-15958-2024.

Mr. Ajay Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-27964-2024.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. These cases involve similar issues and therefore, are being disposed of together by this common judgment and the facts are being derived from CWP-2260-2024.

2. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the order dated 22.12.2023 vide which petitioners, who are Group-D employees, were



CWP-2260-2024 and
other connected cases

ordered to be relieved after attaining the age of 58 years, contrary to Rule 143 of the Haryana Civil Service (General) Rules, 2016, vide which the retirement age of Group-D is 60 years. This Court vide interim order dated 02.02.2024 had directed the petitioners to continue in service.

3. Learned counsel submits that this case being squarely covered by the judgment **Rumali Devi and another vs. State of Haryana and others**¹, whereby a batch of petitions were allowed, against which no appeal has been filed, be disposed of in view of it, the relevant paras whereof read thus:

“10. In order to appreciate the arguments of respondent-State the definition of ‘workman’ as given in the industrial dispute Act, 1947 defined in Section 2 (s) of the said Act needs to be seen. A bare reading of the definition of workman makes it clear that an employee performing certain duties in the course of employment is to be treated as workman and whether the said employee is working on regular basis or temporary is not relevant factor to determine the status of an employee as workman. Hence, even the regular employees working with respondent-State, who are governed under 2016 Rules performing the nature of duties as per the definition of workman will also be covered by the definition of workman and thereby under 2012 Rules, however they are allowed to continue till the age of 60 years under 2016 Rules.

11. Learned counsel for the respondent-State has not been able to rebut the fact that employees who are working on regular basis on a Group-D post and are covered under the definition of workman to whom 2012 Rules applies irrespective of their status of being regular or temporary employee, are retired at the age of 60 years under 2016 Rules. Therefore, once the respondent-State has prescribed a higher age of retirement for a workman working on regular basis under 2016 Rules, there is no valid reason/rationale why the temporary employees who were also workman and are working on the same post be also not given the same higher age of retirement and the action of respondent-State in not allowing temporary workman to continue in service till 60 years of age and in retiring them at the age of 58 years by contending application of the said 2012 Rules is totally arbitrary and illegal and will be discriminatory and cannot be accepted.

xxx

xxx

xxx

13. Further, Rule-17-A of the 2012 Rules as being relied by the respondents is as under:-



“Age of superannuation:- The age for retirement or superannuation of a workman shall be as may be agreed between the employer and the workman under an agreement or as specified in a settlement or award which is binding on both the workman and the employer. Where there is no such agreed age, retirement or superannuation shall be on completion of fifty eight years of age by the workman”

XXX

XXX

XXX

15. In the present case, respondents have framed the 2016 Rules prescribing age of superannuation as 60 years qua regular Group-D employee who are covered by the definition of workman as envisaged under the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. Once 2016 Rules have been framed subsequent to 2012 Rules for employees covered under the definition of workman, who are working on regular Group-D post as per which they are allowed to work till 60 years of age, there is no rationale to suggest why the same should not be made applicable to temporary employees/workmen, who are working on the same group-D post. Further, after prescription of a particular age under 2016 Rules, same will be applicable even under Section 17-A of the 2012 Rules. As per Rule 17-A of the 2012 Rules, which has been reproduced hereinbefore, age of retirement can be prescribed by consent or agreement. The said will also include where Government prescribes the age of retirement of workman which is being applied to the workmen, who are working with the Government of Haryana though on regular basis. Rule 17-A does not differentiate between a regular workman and temporary workman and once an age of 60 years has been prescribed for regular workman in the 2016 rules, the same will ipso facto covers the rule 17-A of the 2012 Rules to govern the workman working with the State of Haryana. Therefore, keeping in view the promulgation of 2016 Rules, even under Rule 17-A of the 2012 Rules, the employee will retire at the age of 60 years as the same has already been prescribed by formulating the statutory rules qua workman.

XXX

XXX

XXX

17. It may be noticed that despite there being no provision under the 2016 Rules governing the service to appoint temporary persons, still the appointments are being made by the Government on temporary basis and the work is being taken from temporary employees for years altogether at lower salary before regularization of their services under any regularization policy issued by the State. Once, the State has taken the liberty of appointing employees on temporary basis on a Group-D post which exist under the rules governing the service, for doing the same nature of work as is being taken from those regularly appointed, the respondent-State cannot be allowed to say that 2016 Rules will not be applicable qua the temporary group-D

employees for the grant of continuity in service till the age of 60 years as allowed to the regular group-D employees working on the same post. Prescribing different standards of retirement age only on the basis of status of workman will be too harsh for a temporary employee/workman without there being any logical differentiation.

18. Further, being a welfare State, once a particular age of retirement has been prescribed under 2016 Rules for Group-D employees and when it is a conceded position that the duties being discharged by the petitioners is within the parameters of those discharged by Group-D employees, there is no justification that the temporary Group-D employees be made to retire at the age of 58 years whereas, the employees discharging the same duties but working on regular basis be allowed to work till the age of 60 years. This differentiation/discrimination has not been justified on basis of any object, which may be sought to be achieved by doing so.

xxx

xxx

xxx

21. Therefore, in light of the above discussed position of law the impugned orders discharging the petitioners from their services at the age of 58 years are set aside and respondents are directed to allow the petitioners i.e. temporary Group-D employees to continue in service till the age of 60 years. It may be noticed that under the interim order of this Court, the petitioners are already discharging duties as temporary group-D employees beyond the age of 58 years and it is directed that the respondents shall not disturb their services so as to retire them before the age of 60 years.”

4. Learned State counsel despite his best efforts has been unable to controvert the factual position and draw out any distinctive aspects in the aforementioned judgment or cite any contrary law.

5. In wake of the above, the present petitions are disposed of in terms of the judgment passed in **Rumali Devi** (supra).

6. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)

JUDGE

12.11.2024

Hemant

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes / No

Whether reportable

:

Yes / No