



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

CWP-13065-2021

Date of Decision:-11.02.2025

Nabab

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J.

1. The instant writ petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 31.01.1996 instead of 01.10.2003 with all consequential benefits in terms of said policy as modified on 18.03.1996.

2. Certain objections were raised by learned counsel for the respondent-State that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of CWP-17474 of 2004 wherein the following prayer was made:

“i) Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to consider the case for regularization of services of the petitioners while taking into consideration any three years and their services be regularized w.e.f. 1.10.2003 with all consequential benefits.

ii) Further direction be also issued to the respondents to decide the legal notice of the petitioners vide Annexure P-4 within a stipulated period.

iii) Any other appropriate writ, order or direction be also issued which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case and to which the



petitioners are found entitled in law justice and equity.

iv) Service of advance notices upon the respondents be dispensed with.

v) Filing of certified copies of Annexures be also dispensed with.

It is further prayed that during the pendency of this writ petition in this Hon'ble Court, services of the petitioners may not be terminated in the interest of justice. “

2. Representation for regularization of petitioner's services from 1.10.2003 was accepted and order of regularization was passed by the respondent. He contends that now the present writ petition has been filed to regularize his services in terms of policy of March, 1996 and the same was barred by principle of res judicata.

3. Today on first call, when the present case was passed over, counsel appearing for the petitioner was specifically apprised that the matter shall be heard and decided since vide order dated 08.07.2024, this Court had specifically ordered that no further adjournment shall be granted. On 25.07.2024, it was informed that father of the arguing counsel had expired and the case was adjourned.

4. When the case was taken up on the second call, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Since, learned counsel for the petitioner has deliberately chosen not to appear notwithstanding the fact that he had been specifically apprised about the matter to be heard today, the present petition is dismissed for non prosecution.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

11.02.2025

Sonia Puri