



CWP-30908-2024

1

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

(121)

CWP-30908-2024

Date of Decision : January 15, 2025

Sunil Kumar

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab through its Secretary and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, DAG, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that the petitioner was serving with the respondents under the outsource policy initially through a contractor namely M/s Sunrise Facilitators Private Limited and after change of the said outsourcing contractor, now the contract has been given to respondent No.6 hence, the respondent No.6 be directed to employ the petitioner.

2. It may be noticed that respondent No.6 is a private agency though respondent No.6 might be having a contract to supply the manpower to a State agency but the said manpower is to be engaged to the satisfaction of respondent No.6 only.

3. Further, no direction can be issued under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by the issuance of a writ petition to a private contractor.

**CWP-30908-2024****2**

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to substantiate his claim that a direction can be issued in favour of the petitioner to respondent No.6, who is a private contractor.

5. Keeping in view the said factual position, no relief as being claimed in the present writ petition can be granted to the petitioner in the writ jurisdiction. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved in any manner qua any action of respondent No.6, he can avail appropriate remedy before the appropriate forum including the Civil Court.

6. The present writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

January 15, 2025*harsha***(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)****JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No