



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

142

CWP-2613-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 30.01.2025

Ashok Kumar

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. H. S. Sehgal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amarpreet Singh Bains, AAG, Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for quashing the order dated 25.10.2024, Annexure P-9, whereby the claim of the petitioner for regularization of his service on the post of Sweeper.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was engaged as Class-IV employee for 89 days basis vide appointment dated 13.07.1993, Annexure P-1 and was to be considered after completion of 240 days in terms of Instructions dated 18.01.1995, Annexure P-2, however, the claim of the petitioner was rejected on the basis of Instructions dated 18.03.2011, Annexure P-10. The premise of non-consideration under the former instructions was that the departments where they were working were not mentioned in the list of the department concerned from where the employees of which were to be considered for regularization, but the same issue has since been decided by this Court in CWP-24337 of 2012, titled **Shri Pal and others versus State of Punjab**



and others, decided on 17.08.2015. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the respondents be directed to reconsider the claim of the petitioner keeping in view the aforesaid judgment.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the respondents would not be averse to have a relook at the matter and decided afresh within a period of 04 months, taking note of the aforesaid judgment, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

4. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. The matter stands disposed of accordingly with a direction to the respondent to reconsider and decide the claim of the petitioner within a period of four months in the light of the aforesaid judgment and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to his interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to him and shall contain reasons, whereupon they shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

30.01.2025
dinesh

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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