



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

211

CWP-29268-2017

Date of decision : 22.10.2024

Neelam

....Petitioner

V/S

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Ajay Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Teevar Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Yogender Verma, Advocate for respondent No.5.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for claiming the following reliefs :-

- “(i) send for the record of the case;
- (ii) To issue a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of order dated 28.11.2017 (Annexure P-19) being against the factual and legal position as explained in the writ petition whereby the claim of the petitioner for regularization has been denied in violation of policies of State Government dated 18.03.2011 (ANNEXURE P-4) and 17.11.2011 (ANNEXURE P-5) and also quash the order dated 07.12.2017 received on 12.12.2017 (ANNEXURE P-20) vide which the services of the petitioner has been terminated, so much so, it has been passed without associating petitioner at the time of consideration of her case, in breach of directions issued in **CWP No.11047 of 2013, Kamaljit Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab & others** decided on 11.04.2016 (Annexure P-8) as well as it suffers from discrimination;



CWP-29268-2017

-2-

(iii) *To issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the services of petitioner in view of the policies of regularization dated 18.03.2011 (Annexure P-4) and 17.11.2011 (Annexure P-5) and thereafter, grant all consequential benefits alongwith interest @ 18% per annum;*

(iv) *It is further prayed that a writ in nature of mandamus be issued directing respondent department not to replace petitioner with another set of contractual employee.*

(v) *It is also prayed that during pendency of the present writ petition operation of impugned order dated 28.11.2017 (ANNEXURE P-19) & 07.12.2017 (ANNEXURE P-20) may kindly be stayed or in alternative status quo qua the services of the petitioner be maintained.”*

2. On 22.12.2017, while issuing notice of motion to the respondents, operation of the impugned order dated 07/12.12.2017 (Annexure P-20) was stayed.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.5 submits that during the pendency of the present petition, the petitioner continued in service under the interim order passed by this Court and thereafter, he has resigned from service on 02.02.2024 and the said resignation has been accepted on 05.02.2024 by the competent authority and the petitioner has been relieved from service. Therefore, the instant petition has been rendered infructuous.

4. Disposed of as having become infructuous.

22.10.2024

kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No