

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH



J

1. Though the issue raised before the learned Single Judge was claiming of seniority from the date the appellants were appointed on *ad hoc*

basis and granting them the benefit of said services for seniority purposes, which has been rejected by the learned Single Judge, learned counsel for the appellants confined his prayer in the present appeals to the counting of services of the appellants from the date of their regularization.

2. We find that although there is no such seniority list before us but it is the contention of the learned counsel for the appellants that the appellants have been left out from consideration and placement in the seniority list.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents does not object to the claim of the appellants of being placed in the seniority list from the date they have been regularized.
4. The law is well settled on this aspect and, therefore, we need not further delve upon this issue and dispose of these appeals directing that the appellants’ placement in the seniority list would be made from the date, they were regularized.
5. The appeals are accordingly stand disposed of.
6. All pending misc. application(s) also stand disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)

JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)

JUDGE

06.03.2025

rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned? : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable? : Yes/No