



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

CWP-18156-2025

Date of Decision: 16.07.2025

Vijay Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State Of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Sajjan Singh Malik, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of Resolution No.11 dated 03.06.2025 to the extent that contract of the petitioner has been terminated.

2. The petitioner is a practicing lawyer. He was appointed as Legal Retainer by respondent No.3 w.e.f. 25.08.2022. His appointment was approved by Board of Directors in its meeting dated 29.09.2022. His service tenure was extended from time to time by Board of Directors. His remuneration was also enhanced. He was awarded Appreciation Certificate on 26.01.2025. His remuneration was further enhanced in April' 2025. On account of a complaint by Amandeep Singh Gill, Advocate, the respondent-Board of Directors considered case of

petitioner and concluded that he has not been appointed against a sanctioned post and his services are not further required. In view of Board Resolution, he was removed from the status of Legal Retainer.

3. Mr. Sajjan Singh Malik, Advocate submits that petitioner was working with respondent since 2022 and was abruptly terminated in 2025. He was not issued any charge-sheet. He was further not granted any opportunity of hearing. There are many persons who are working against non-sanctioned posts, however, petitioner was isolated.

4. *Per Contra*, Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate submits that there was a complaint by another practicing lawyer who submitted evidence to the effect that petitioner is in regular practice. It was also observed by the Board that petitioner has given wrong advice in a serious matter. He was not appointed against sanctioned post and was a mere retainer. He could not be treated as regular employee, thus, Board as per its wisdom, discontinued his services.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner was appointed as Legal Retainer. He was not appointed against sanctioned post. The Board of Directors in its meeting considered his case and found that his services are no more required. It is not a case that petitioner was appointed as regular employee or against a sanctioned post. The Board of Directors have considered nature of service and act & conduct of the petitioner. The Board has also considered information supplied by Amandeep Singh Gill, Advocate.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any factual or legal infirmity in the impugned order warranting interference. The present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

16.07.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No