

Date of Decision : 14-01-2025

1. **CWP-5471-1992 (O&M)**

SARBJIT SINGH AND ORS.

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR.

.....Respondent

2. **CWP-14683-2004 (O&M)**

RANVIR KUMAR AND ORS.

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR.

.....Respondent

3. **CWP-1532-2008 (O&M)**

KRISHAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PB. AND ANR.

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate with
Ms. Anamika Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No.1532 of 2008 and
CWP No.5471 of 1992.

None for the petitioner in CWP No.14683 of 2004.

Mr. S.K Raghuvanshi, Advocate for
Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate
For respondent Nos.10, 17, 23, 33, 67, 91,
96, 85 and 93.

Mr. U.M.Khan, Advocate for
Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate
For the respondent No.35 in CWP No.14683 of 2004.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. Present bunch of three writ petitions involve common question of law in the background of common set of facts and thus they are being decided by a common order.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the petitioners are seeking the benefit of regularisation of their services from the date of their initial appointment on the ground that the posts were duly advertised and the selection process was undertaken though, the appointment was given on *ad hoc* basis, which was subsequently regularised hence, the seniority of the petitioners should be ascertained keeping in view the initial date of appointment.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that the similar claim was raised qua the selection done in the cadre of Draftsmen also and keeping in view the order dated 06.10.2024 passed in CWP No.25441 of 2012, the respondents vide order dated 19.12.2014 allowed the benefit in favour of the Draftsmen hence, the respondents were under obligation to consider the similar claim of the petitioners on the same footing granting the said benefit to the petitioners also.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State submits that the claim of the petitioner(s) will be considered in light of the order passed by the Chief Engineer/Drainage and Irrigation Works, Punjab, Chandigarh on 19.12.2014, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-18 and an appropriate speaking order on the claim of the petitioner(s) will

be passed within a period of 8 weeks from the receipt of copy of this order and in case, if is found feasible to accept the claim of the petitioner(s) that the petitioners are also entitled for the benefit as extended by the State vide the order dated 19.12.2014, the petitioners will also be granted the same benefit, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned in the speaking order for not accepting their claim, which reasons will be conveyed to the petitioner(s) for their information and necessary action.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that keeping in view of the statement of the learned State counsel, the present set of three petitions may kindly be disposed of as having been not pressed any further.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

8. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

14-01-2025
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES/NO
Whether reportable: YES/NO