



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

139

LPA-1615-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 14.10.2024

JAGDISH PARSHAD

...Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Nihal S. Choudhary, Advocate with
Mr. Surinder Darria, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl. AG, Haryana.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J.(ORAL)

1. Through his writ petition, which has been disposed of through the impugned judgment passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court, the appellant had sought issuance of directions to the respondents to regularize his services in terms of the policies of the State of Haryana dated 07.03.1996 and 01.10.2003 and in support of his case, he had primarily placed reliance on a judgment of this Court dated 13.03.2024 passed in CWP-2158 of 2020 – *Ashish Sharma and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*.

2. A perusal of the impugned judgment reveals that the learned Single Judge, after referring to various paragraphs of the judgment in *Ashish Sharma's* case (supra), accepted the appellant's plea and disposed of his petition in terms of *Ashish Sharma's* case (supra).



3. In paragraph No.43 of the judgment in *Ashish Sharma's* case (supra), a direction has been issued to the State to pass appropriate orders in terms of the findings returned in the judgment on the prayer made by the petitioners therein with regard to regularization of their services. It has further been observed that in case the petitioners therein are found entitled to regularization/retrospective regularization of their services, they shall not be entitled to any arrears up to the date of the filing of their writ petition.
4. Through the present appeal the appellant seeks modification in the impugned judgment to the extent of grant of arrears from the date the appellant's services would be regularized.
5. Once before the learned Single Judge the appellant had sought and got his writ petition to be allowed in terms of *Ashish Sharma's* case (supra) he now cannot be allowed to seek a relief more than what has been granted on his own asking especially when the impugned judgment reveals that no such claim was also made by him before the learned Single Judge.
6. Dismissed.
7. All pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

October 14, 2024

Nisha Yadav

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No