

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

221

CWP-8027-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.04.2024

Amit Ohri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. B.K. Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Gupta, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J (Oral)

1. The prayer in the present petition is for directing the respondent Nos.1 to 3 to regularize the services of the petitioner and to pay equal emoluments with all other benefits.

2. Learned counsel would contend that the petitioner applied against the advertisement dated 17.10.2009 but was appointed as an Assistant District Attorney on 15.12.2011 on contractual basis, later than other appointees and only after directions by this Court vide order dated 06.07.2011, in CWP-11495-2011. He, after 3 years of service on 17.12.2014, became eligible for regularization but was not considered, though similarly situated persons, appointed prior to him were, on completion of the aforesaid period, regularized vide order dated 08.10.2013, Annexure P-12. He has filed a number of representations in that regard, but have not evoked response. He, on instructions, submits that the claim of the petitioner be directed to be decided in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel has no objection to the limited prayer made.

4. In view of the above and without commenting upon the merits of the

decide the claim of the petitioner within three months, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner. Upon doing so, after notice and hearing offered to her and if found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to their interest, the same shall contain reasons and petitioner shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

25.04.2024

Hemant

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