

(2006) 08 P&H CK 0322
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : CWP No. 12449 of 2006

Arun Lata

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-08-2006

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2006) 08 P&H CK 0322

Hon'ble Judges : M.M.S. Bedi, J;M.M. Kumar, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : K.L. Dhingra, for the Appellant;

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

M.M. Kumar, J.—The petitioner was appointed on 24.9.1997 on the post of C & V teacher. The nature of the appointment was contractual on a fixed salary of Rs. 3500/-. She joined the service on 1.10.1997 (Annexure P.2) and was relieved on 27.4.1998 on the joining of Shri Charanjit Singh, Punjabi teacher (Annexure P.5). She made numerous representations stating that certain similarly situated persons have also been given appointment. Accordingly a prayer has been made by her that the relieving order dated 27.4.1998 (Annexure P.5) be quashed and she be reinstated in service.

2. Having heard the learned Counsel, we are of the considered view that the relief claimed by the petitioner cannot be granted because a contractual employee does not acquire any right to hold the post on permanent/ regular basis.

3. It is clear from the appointment letter issued to the petitioner that the nature of her appointment is contractual at a fixed salary of Rs. 3500/-. She has been relieved of her duties on 27.4.1998 when the regular appointed person has joined. A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in the case of Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others Vs. Umadevi and Others, has laid down that such contractual appointees do not acquire any right of continuation in service.

4. Therefore, we find no substance in the submissions made by the learned Counsel.
5. The writ petition is wholly without merit and the same is accordingly dismissed.