



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

Sr. No.110

CWP-24397-2025

Date of Decision: 12.09.2025

Ishopati and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.**TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)**

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to allow the petitioners to join service as Para-Teaching Associates (PGT History and PGT Commerce) in Government Girls Senior Secondary School, Bhiwani.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners were engaged as Para-Teaching Associates vide deployment offer letters, dated 15.03.2024, Annexure P-1, up to 15.03.2025. Their term of engagement was extended up to 31.03.2025, but were relieved from engagement thereafter. The contention is that they were entitled to further extension in service in terms of memo dated 21.07.2025, Annexure P-7, issued by the Director, Secondary Education, whereby contract of PGTs working through Haryana Kaushal Rozgar Nigam Limited (HKRNL) was extended up to 31.07.2025.

3. Learned State counsel has received instructions from the Department vide memo dated 11.09.2025, a photocopy whereof is retained



on the case file as Annexure 'A' along with the list of PGTs engaged through HKRNL appended thereto. Referring to the same, she contends that only for want of workload for PGT History and PGT Commerce in the School and the resultant rationalization in manpower, the petitioners were not given extension in service. The relevant instructions to that effect read as under:

The concerned Principal has been relieved the petitioners on the basis of rationalization in school vide letter no. KW 4/01-2025 SE(C) 2025-26 dated 17.03.2025, the school committee assessed the workload of all teachers and found that workload of only 4 PGT History and 2 PGT Commerce was available and hence both HKRN employees on the post of PGT History and one HKRN employee on the post of PGT Commerce were rendered surplus.

As per HKRNL deployment offer letter term/condition No. 8, the deployment of a manpower can be terminated by HKRNL on the recommendation of Head of Department (HoD) of the intending organization due to any of the following reasons non-availability of fund, change in guidelines, rationalization of manpower joining of a regular employee completion of requisite works cessation of vacancy etc.

It is further stated that for service extension of HKRNL Employees who were working through HKRNL, their service extension request has to be sent through HKRNL Portal. Before raising this request, the Principal have to check the conditions mentioned on portal and has to give a certificate to that effect as mentioned below:-

“I hereby declare that the contract period of the above mentioned manpower is about to expire and his/her services are still required. And above said manpower fulfills the eligibility conditions under the relevant job role available on Nigam Portal and his/her performance is satisfactory. I have also obtained required approval for contract extension of above manpower from the Finance Department & Head of the Department”



Keeping in view of the above mentioned conditions and non-availability of workload of PGT History and PGT Commerce, no further extension request has been raised by the concerned School.

It is also contended that the memo dated 21.07.2025 is not applicable to the petitioners, as they have been relieved on expiry of their extended tenure on 31.03.2025, and it grants extension only from the date it was issued.

4. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds no ground to entertain the petition as the petitioners have been relieved from service on expiry of their extended tenure that was up to 31.03.2025. They could not be considered for further extension on account of there being no workload in the School for the subjects they were engaged. Besides, the benefit of memo dated 21.07.2025 can also not be claimed by them as, apparently, it is meant for those PGTs who were actually working on that date.

5. In view thereof, finding no merit the petition stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

12.09.2025
Maninder

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