



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

121

CWP-6102-2025Date of Decision: 05.03.2025

Mahender Singh and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India are claiming that they may be permitted to mark their presence electronically.

2. The petitioners are working with respondent as Group-D employees. They are claiming that higher officials are compelling them to work beyond prescribed hours. They are compelled to mark their presence in the daily register maintained by Incharge who, sometimes does not permit them to mark their presence. He compels them to perform duties which are not part of their job.

3. Mr. Saini submits that petitioners' grievance would be redressed if respondents are directed to decide their representation in terms of order dated 18.07.2014 passed by this Court in ***CWP-13853-2014, Partap Giri and others vs. State of Haryana and others.***

4. Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana, who on advance notice is present in Court, submits that competent authority would consider grievance of the petitioners and do the needful.

5. Mr. Saini agrees to the aforesaid arrangement.

6. In the wake of statement of both sides, instant petition stands disposed of.

05.03.2025

shivani

Whether reasoned/speaking

Whether reportable

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No