



109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-30463-2025

Date of Decision: 11.02.2026

GURPREET SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL.

Present:- Mr. Harish Chandra, Advocate with
Mr. Jaskirat Singh, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Manbir Singh Batth, Advocate with
Mr. Ritish Watts, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 & 3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 29.11.2024 whereby he has been terminated from the post of Sanitary Inspector (OS) on the ground that his work was found unsatisfactory.

2. Mr. Manbir Singh Batth, Advocate has appeared and filed memorandum of appearance on behalf of the respondent Nos.2 & 3. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. The petitioner joined as Sanitary Inspector on 14.08.2014. He along with other employees filed **CWP No.27969 of 2017** before this Court claiming that one set of temporary employees cannot be substituted by another set of employees. Work and conduct of petitioner was appreciated by Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh in March' 2019. His work during Covid-19 was also appreciated. A memo dated 06.02.2024 was prepared



to the effect that due to non-availability of sewage system, sewage waste was dumped in open area and illegal construction was made. There was communication between different authorities to the effect that there is need for creating proper sewage system in Village Faidan. The sanitation, during inspection of Sectors 31, 32, 33 & 47 and Village Faidan, was not found satisfactory. The petitioner was asked to submit his explanation. He submitted his detailed reply dated 29.11.2024 explaining practical difficulties in the work. He clarified that there was no fault on his part. The respondent has terminated his service vide impugned order dated 29.11.2024.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that petitioner was discharged in 2024. He was engaged through outsourcing agency i.e. M/s R.R. Enterprises. He was not an employee of the corporation. This Court in *CWP-27969-2017* restrained to substitute one set of employees with another set of employees. The petitioner has not been substituted by any other employee whereas his act and conduct was not found satisfactory, thus, agency was asked to take him back.

5. The petitioner was engaged through outsourcing agency. He was not an employee of Municipal Corporation. This Court cannot ask outsourcing agency to adopt particular manner or method while retaining or retrenching former employees. The Municipal Corporation Authorities may, if deem convenient, form some policy, however, this Court cannot issue any direction in this regard because no fundamental or vested right of the petitioner is involved.

6. This Court vide order dated 05.08.2025 has dismissed **CWP-22438-2025** titled as ***Pyara Singh and Others V/s Municipal Corporation,***

Chandigarh and Others, (2025) PHHC 099692 involving identical issues. The



aforesaid order was challenged by way of Intra Court Appeal which came to be dismissed vide order dated 25.09.2025 passed in **LPA-2751-2025**.

7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

8. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

11.02.2026
SDK

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