

**(2013) 08 P&H CK 0934**

**High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh**

**Case No:** C.W.P. No. 4663 of 2011

Sudesh Kumari

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and Others

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision:** Aug. 23, 2013

**Citation:** (2014) 1 SCT 693

**Hon'ble Judges:** Ajay Tewari, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Final Decision:** Allowed

---

**Judgement**

Ajay Tewari, J.

This order shall dispose of the aforesaid two petitions bearing C.W.P. Nos. 4663 and 10284 of 2011. Since common questions of law and facts are involved, the same are being disposed of by this common order. The facts are being taken from C.W.P. No. 4663 of 2011. By this petition the petitioner claims retiral benefits. She was appointed as a Craft Teacher on 1.5.76 in the Panchayat Samiti, Karnal. Thereafter the following order was passed on 13.5.85 regularising her services:-

From

Commissioner & Secretary to Govt. of Haryana Development and Panchayat Department

To

All the Deputy Commissioners in the State of Haryana.

Memo. No. 632-1ECD-III-83/3287

Chandigarh, Dated 4.5.83

Subject: Regarding Service of Sewing Teachers.

Reference: This department memo. N. 435-IECD-111-83/1304 dated 18.2.83.

Government has taken decision on the above noted subject that the Sewing Teachers should possess 3 years or more service for appointment on regular posts. Sewing Teachers working in the State and having three years or more service and still not appointed on regular posts their details are as under:-

These female Sewing Teachers are allocated as under for their regular appointment:-

2. In the year 2005 a new scheme was started called DWCRA Scheme by the respondent-State of Haryana in each block and under the scheme an additional post of Gram Sevika was sanctioned. Those posts were lying vacant and, therefore, Government felt that since great hardship was being faced in the proper implementation of the scheme the department of Development and Panchayats was ordered to take 45 teachers in the Development Department by transfer on ad hoc basis. The petitioner was one of those 45 regular Craft Teachers who were transferred under the said scheme. By letter dated 01.10.2003 the respondents took a decision to regularise all persons who were working on ad hoc basis and pursuant thereto the services of 33 out of 45 Craft Teachers were regularised as Gram Sewika including some who were junior to the petitioner as Craft Teachers. The case of the petitioner and other persons could not be considered because their service record was not available. In the meantime the petitioner retired on 31.01.2010. Much to her shock she was denied retiral benefits on the ground that her services as Gram Sewika had not been regularised and at the time when she had joined as a Gram Sewika she had given an undertaking that she would not claim any benefit of her previous service as a Craft Teacher. Hence the present petition.

3. In reply the above stand has been reiterated and it has been further asserted that by the time the record of the petitioner was traced out the scheme of regularisation had lapsed and she had retired. As per the State once the scheme had lapsed the petitioner could not be regularised.

4. The first argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the right of the petitioner for regularisation crystallised on the date when a person junior to her was regularised and thereafter what the petitioner would be asserting would not be so much a right of regularisation but a right of non discrimination. He has further argued that had the scheme not lapsed and subsequently petitioner's case considered for regularisation it would have to be from the date her junior was regularised. In these circumstances as per learned counsel the fact that the scheme lapsed would have no relation to the case of the petitioner for regularisation with effect from the date her junior was regularised. He has further relied upon a decision of this Court in C.W.P. No. 17695 of 2011 decision on 27.03.2012, *Dropadi Devi v. State of Haryana* and has argued that the petitioner therein was one of the persons who were junior to the petitioner and whose case has also similarly not

been regularised. In the said case this Court held as follows:-

2. If the petitioner had been made regular from a particular date through an order and continued in the same department and assigned to a different duty and a different designation, the fact that an undertaking was received cannot be taken to estop the person from contending that the service she has put in the same department in another capacity should be excluded. The issue was answered in a slightly different situation by a Bench of this Court in *Om Pati v. State of Haryana*, 2007 (1) S.C.T. 294 : 2007 1 RSJ 582. The Bench was considering the issue of counting of service in a Panchayat Samiti for eligibility for family pension for the person that was absorbed in the said service. The Court held that the service rendered in Panchayat Samiti which in terms of Government policy also allowed for absorption in the State service would make the person eligible to count such service in Panchayat Samiti as aggregating to pensionable service. I would apply the same principle and hold that notwithstanding the undertaking given by the petitioner that she would not claim benefit of past service it cannot operate to estop her. The petitioner shall be granted the service period of Craft teacher in the Panchayat Samiti as part of pensionable service and the pension shall be worked on that basis and the arrears be released to her within a period of 12 weeks.

5. He has further pointed out that this judgment has become final and all the benefits have been released to that petitioner.

6. In my opinion the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner cannot be brushed aside. In the circumstances the aforesaid writ petitions are allowed and the respondents are directed to grant to the petitioner/s the same benefits as have been granted to the said Dropadi Devi. Let the necessary exercise of working the same out and releasing them be carried out within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order failing which the petitioner would be entitled to claim the same with interest at the rate of 8% p.a. from the date of her retirement till the date of payment.