

214 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2024:PHHC:100769



CWP-8583-2000

Date of Decision: 06.08.2024

RAJINDER PARSHAD

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to grant benefit of *ad hoc* service from 24.08.1982 to 28.04.1984, for the purpose of regularisation in terms of policy dated 28.04.1997, Annexure P-5.

2. Learned State counsel contends that the petitioner's service was regularised with effect from 01.01.1991, in terms of the notification dated 28.02.1991, Annexure P-4, since he had completed the requisite two years *ad hoc* service up to 31.12.1990. His claim for regularisation in terms of the policy, dated 28.04.1997, is not admissible since it requires minimum *ad hoc* service of two years up to 01.11.1986.

3. It is apparent on record that the petitioner was appointed for the first time on 24.08.1982 on *ad hoc* basis, and served upto 28.04.1984. Later, after a gap of two years and six months, he was again appointed on *ad hoc* basis on 27.10.1986. Therefore, on the cut off date, in terms of policy dated 28.04.1997, he had not completed the requisite *ad hoc* service and could not

have been regularised in terms thereof. Besides, there is no provision in the government instructions for condonation of such a long break in service as exists in his case.

4. These facts have not been disputed by the petitioner by filing any counter affidavit.

5. In view thereof, there is no merit in the claim and the petition stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

06.08.2024

kv

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