



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

149

LPA-1587-2025

Date of Decision : **August 18, 2025**

RAVINDER KUMAR

.....Appellant

VERSUS

MEHAR SINGH AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present : Mr. Shubham Saroha, Advocate for the appellant.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant is aggrieved by dismissal of his writ petition by the learned Single Judge vide order dated 08.04.2025. In the writ petition, the appellant has assailed the order passed by the Additional Registrar dated 18.08.2000 and the restoration of order dated 09.11.1999.

2. Undisputed facts of the case are that the appellant was appointed as a Clerk on purely adhoc basis on 15.12.1997. Within three months of his engagement, he was regularized w.e.f. 16.03.1998. One Mehar Singh challenged the petitioner's regularization before the Additional Registrar, who dismissed the petition vide order dated 09.11.1999. Further the appeal filed by Mehar Singh was allowed on 18.08.2000 and the appointment of the appellant has been held bad in law.

3. Appellant's contention that the interference with his regularization order was uncalled for or unsustainable has not found favour with the learned Single Judge. The learned Single Judge has also noticed of

the fact that the order was passed way back in August 2000 and after a lapse of nearly 25 years, no relief can be granted to him.

3. On a pointed query raised to the learned counsel for the appellant, it has not been shown that the post against which the appointment was offered to the appellant was ever advertised. The submission made at the bar is that the post was advertised by beat of drum. This ordinarily is not the process vide which the advertisement could be made or the public could be made aware that the post is proposed to be filled up. The nature of the appointment offered to the appellant is, therefore, not backed by any procedure known to law. Even otherwise, no policy has been placed before the Court on the strength of which such adhoc appointment could be regularized within a period of 3 months. In such circumstances when the Additional Registrar has held the appointment to be invalid and the learned Single Judge has refused to interfere in the matter, we hardly find any ground to entertain the present petition.

4. In that view of the matter, the present Letters Patent Appeal is dismissed.

5. All pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

August 18, 2025
ajaysharma

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