



125

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

CWP-34510-2024**Date of Decision:08.01.2025****RAJVEER AND OTHERS**

..... Petitioners

Versus

**STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE CHIEF SECRETARY
CUM CHAIRMAN HARYANA AND OTHERS Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. Deepak Sonak, Advocate with
Mr. Raman Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Advocate with
Mr. Divyanshu Kaushik, Advocate
Mr. Simran Sharma, Advocate and
Ms. Mannat Kaur, Advocate
for respondents No.3 to 6.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to consider them for the post of Category-D.

2. The petitioners are claiming that they have worked for quite long time with respondent No.3 as Category-D employees. The respondent has not extended their contract w.e.f. 01.06.2024. There are possibilities that respondent may engage another set of employees.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana and Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Advocate accept notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 3 to



6 respectively and waive service.

5. With consent of learned counsel for the parties, the case is taken up for final disposal.

6. Learned counsel for respondents No.3 to 6 submits that petitioners have not been substituted/replaced by another set of employee, thus, instant petition is premature. The petitioners would be considered as and when appointments are made for the post of Category-D employees.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners agrees to the aforesaid arrangement.

8. In the wake of statement of both sides, the present petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

08.01.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No