

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CWP-11097-1997 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.01.2025

SAUDHI AND OTHERS

....PETITIONERS

Vs.

HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, PANCHKULA AND
OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: None for petitioner Nos. 1, 4 and 5.

 Mr. Gaurav Bakshi, Advocate
 for petitioner Nos. 2 and 3.

 Mr. Amit Jaiswal, Advocate
 for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

 Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J (ORAL)

1. Mr. Amit Jaiswal, Advocate submits that petitioners have already been regularized and their date of regularization is detailed as below:-

Serial No.	Name of Petitioner(s)	Date of regularization	Present status
1.	Saudhi	01.02.1996	Expired on 27.02.2019. All benefits paid.
2.	Kovindan	Quit the service during the year 2001 and went to his native place in Tamil Nadu and never came back	N.A.
3.	Sita Rasan	Regularized w.e.f. 01.07.2004	Presently in service
4.	Ayaswami	Regularized w.e.f. 01.07.2004	Presently in service
5.	Pandurangan	Regularized w.e.f. 01.02.1996	Presently in service



CWP-11097-1997 (O&M) -2-

2. The petitioners have already been regularized except petitioner No. 2 who left his job in 2001. The petitioners stand regularized and they are getting salary as regular employees since then, thus, no further order is warranted. This Court does not find it appropriate to order the respondent to regularize them from retrospective date especially when petitioner Nos. 1 and 5 have been regularized w.e.f. 01.02.1996 and petitioner Nos. 3 and 4 w.e.f. 01.07.2004. This Court has expressed similar opinion in a bunch of writ petitions including CWP-10071 of 2022.

3. Dismissed.

4. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

30.01.2025
manoj

[JAGMOHAN BANSAL]
JUDGE

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