
(2006) 08 P&H CK 0216
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : C.W.P. No. 6508 of 2005

Des Raj

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 21-08-2006

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2006) 08 P&H CK 0216

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

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : R.S. Mamli, for the Appellant; Harish Rathee, D.A.G., for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

M.M. Kumar, J.—This petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution prays for quashing order dated 7.2.2005 (P-6). A further prayer has been made to issue directions to the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner with all consequential benefits from due date. It is appropriate to mention here that the petitioner joined with the respondent department in the year 1988 on daily wage basis. On the basis of the regularisation policies formulated by the State of Haryana, the petitioner earlier filed C.W.P. No. 8238 of 1999 in this Court seeking regularisation of his services, which was dismissed. However, liberty was granted to the petitioner to file a detailed representation before the authorities who were to decide the same within a period of three months from the day the representation was made after taking into account all the relevant instructions and to pass a fresh speaking order. The respondents did not regularise the services of the petitioner and passed an order dated 5.12.2002, rejecting the case of the petitioner (P-5). The petitioner again approached this Court by filing C.W.P. No. 9126 of 2004. The said writ petition was disposed of on 18.9.2004 and the order reads as under:

The controversy raised by the petitioner relates to regularisation. It is not

possible to examine the instant controversy in exercise of our jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, in view of the fact that there are certain disputes on a vital factual aspect of the controversy i.e. the number of days during which the petitioner had rendered service while in the employment of the respondents.

In the facts and circumstances of the matter, we consider it just and appropriate to afford an opportunity to the petitioner to furnish further details to the respondents so as to substantiate the number of days during which he had discharged his duties (of course keeping in mind the cut off date envisaged under the relevant policy instructions). The needful be done through a representation within three months from today.

On the filing of such representation, the claim of the petitioner shall be reconsidered for regularisation by the competent authority in accordance with the relevant policy instructions read with judgments rendered by this Court in *Tek Chand v. State of Haryana* 2002 (1) SCT 308 and *Kavita Gandhi v. State of Haryana* 1997 (4) RSJ 760 and any other relevant judgment on the point, and a well reasoned speaking order shall be passed within three months from the date of submission of the aforesaid representation along with a certified copy of the instant order.

In case the petitioner is found entitled for regularisation, he shall also be entitled to all consequential benefits from the date of his regularisation. Till the final decision of the matter at the hands of the respondents, status quo shall be maintained qua services of the petitioner. Disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given/issued on payment of usual charges.

2. In compliance with the aforementioned order, the Divisional Forest Officer, Yamuna Nagar Forest Division, Yamuna Nagar, passed a detailed speaking order dated 7.2.2005 (P-6) and rejected the claim of the petitioner, which is the subject matter of challenge in the instant petition.

3. Having heard the learned Counsel for the parties and perusing the record, we are of the considered view that no mandamus can now be issued for regularization of the services of the petitioner because of the view taken by Hon^{ble} the Supreme Court in a Constitution Bench judgment in the case of *Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others Vs. Umadevi and Others*, . Similar matter has come up before this Court in *Rajinder Kumar v. State of Haryana and Ors.* C.W.P. No. 7563 of 2005, decided on 25.4.2006) wherein similar arguments were raised and we have dismissed the same in view of law laid down in *Uma Devi's case* (supra).

4. Therefore, the writ petition fails and the same is dismissed.