



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CWP-12282-1999(O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.02.2025

BALBIR KAUR

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Amrindra Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Arya, DAG, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the appointments of respondents no.4 to 8 as Punjabi teachers on *ad hoc* basis in different High Schools of Ambala District. Further, a writ of *mandamus* has been sought directing the respondents to consider the petitioner for appointment to the post of Punjabi teacher on *ad hoc* basis against one of the eight regular posts vacant in different High Schools of the District.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner was appointed as Punjabi teacher on *ad hoc* basis vide letter dated 09.09.1996. She continued working up to 30.04.1998, and was relieved due to appointment of regular Punjabi teachers. Respondents no.4 and 8 were appointed as Punjabi teachers on *ad hoc* basis on 28.02.1997 and 04.10.1996, respectively; they had also been so relieved. Despite being juniors, they were again appointed on *ad hoc* basis in the District, whereas the petitioner was not



considered. She filed the instant petition which was admitted for regular hearing vide order dated 19.09.2001, and could not be taken up for hearing for quite long. He also contends that respondents no.4 and 8 were later regularised in service. Accordingly, the petitioner has a right to be re-appointed as well as considered for regularisation.

3. Undisputed facts on record are, the petitioner was engaged as Punjabi teacher purely on *ad hoc* basis till the appointment of a regularly selected candidate. She had been relieved so that the regularly selected candidate could join in her place. Ever since she has not been in service. The persons who were statedly appointed after her, respondents no.4 and 8, had been re-engaged after some time and were regularised as well. This in itself cannot be a ground to re-engage the petitioner at this stage, considering that she has been out of service since 30.04.1998. There is no material on record to show that the posts are still vacant. Besides, the petitioner has not sought regularisation in service.

4. In view thereof, there is no merit in the petition and it stands dismissed.

5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

17.02.2025
Ad

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>