



110 (4 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. **LPA-2499-2024 (O&M)**
Date of Decision: 05.02.2025
SATISH KUMARAppellant(s)
V/s.
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondents
2. **LPA-2633-2024 (O&M)**
JAI PAL AND ANOTHERAppellant(s)
V/s.
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondents
3. **LPA-2640-2024 (O&M)**
JAI PARKASHAppellant(s)
V/s.
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondents
4. **LPA-2723-2024 (O&M)**
JAI KISHANAppellant(s)
V/s.
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondents

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA**
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present Mr. Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the applicants-appellants.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J. (Oral)

CM-6085-LPA-2024 in LPA-2499-2024

CM-6444-LPA-2024 in LPA-2633-2024

CM-6453-LPA-2024 in LPA-2640-2024

CM-6632-LPA-2024 in LPA-2723-2024

1. These applications are filed by the appellants for seeking condonation of delay in filing the LPAs.

2. We find that the delay in filing all these appeals has essentially occurred on account of COVID-19. Therefore, we allow all the applications and condone the delay in filing of all these LPAs.

MAIN CASES

3. This order shall dispose of these four connected LPAs as the issue involved in these cases is common.



4. These four LPAs have been preferred against order dated 22.07.2019 passed by the learned Single Bench in a bunch of four Writ Petitions in which lead case was CWP-20330-2013.

5. On merits, we find that the appellants have been ousted by the learned Single Bench on the ground that they were regularized in the year 1998 and have taken up their cause for regularization w.e.f. 1994/1995 only by serving a legal notice on 15.05.2012 i.e. after a period of more than 14 years. Therefore, the appellants have not raised their grievance within a reasonable time. Moreover, we find that the Policy for regularizing the Drivers/Conductors, who had completed two years' service on contract basis, was issued on 28.07.1994 and was withdrawn on 17.11.1995 and the service record of the appellants was too dismal and insufficient for consideration for regularization as in the case of one of the appellants, it is noticed that there were 10 warnings besides one punishment of censure and similarly, other appellants, who are before us, have suffered several punishments for the intervening period.

6. We, therefore, do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned Single Bench. The Appeals are found to be misconceived and without merits and the same are dismissed accordingly.

7. All pending applications filed in these Appeals shall stand disposed of accordingly.

[SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA]
JUDGE

[MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA]
JUDGE

February 5, 2025
Ess Kay

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes	/	No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes	/	No