

2025:PHHC:095645



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

127

**CWP-21663-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.07.2025.**

BASTI RAM

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Surinder Kumar Daaria, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ. J (ORAL).

The prayer made in the instant writ petition is for directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization, however, it remains undisputed that the petitioner had earlier filed a civil writ petition seeking, amongst other reliefs, the relief of regularization under the Policy of 2003. It is also not in dispute that the said relief was not granted by the learned Single Judge while deciding the writ petition. The only observation recorded in the said order dated 11.05.2022, by the learned Single Judge, was that the respondents shall not dispense with the services of the petitioner in the event, the services are required for the Haryana Community Forest Project. Aggrieved thereof, the petitioner

2025:PHHC:095645



preferred a Letters Patent Appeal (LPA) No.819 of 2022 raising a specific plea that his claim for seeking regularization despite being a project employee has not been adverted to by the learned Single Judge. Notice of motion was issued specifically after noticing the arguments. It is also not in dispute that LPA-819-2022 was dismissed for want of prosecution on 24.04.2023. The application seeking adjudication after restoration was also dismissed as withdrawn.

2 Be that as it may, the Hon'ble Division Bench, while dismissing the LPA, specifically noted that similar controversy had already been dealt with by a Coordinate Bench vide **judgment dated 29.11.2022 passed in LPA-738-2022 titled as 'Ram Chander and others Vs. State of Haryana and others.'** The CM-1612-LPA-2023 for seeking restoration, however, the said application was dismissed as withdrawn.

3 The present petition is an attempt now, for seeking a relief which would be deemed to have been declined by the learned Single Judge in his judgment dated 11.05.2022 and the said order having been affirmed by the Division Bench in LPA-819-2022 preferred by the petitioner titled as 'Basti Ram Vs. State of Haryana and others' decided on 24.04.2023 by relying upon the judgment dated 29.11.2022 passed in LPA-738-2022 titled as **Ram Chander and others (supra)**.

4 Not only the present round of litigation would be barred by the principles of res judicata but also on merits since there is nothing on

2025:PHHC:095645



record as to how the case of the petitioner would not be hit by the judgment in the matter of **Ram Chander and others (supra)**, which was relied upon by the Division Bench.

5 I find that the present case is only a mischievous attempt on the part of the petitioner to initiate a fresh round of litigation for a relief that has already been denied to him. This Court would have ordinarily imposed heavy costs on such a litigant, however, a lenient view is being taken on request of petitioner.

6 The present writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

July 30, 2025
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No