

## Baldev Singh Vs State of Punjab

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

**Date of Decision:** July 14, 2014

**Hon'ble Judges:** Jasbir Singh, J; Harinder Singh Sidhu, J

**Bench:** Division Bench

**Advocate:** R.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the Appellant; Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, DAG and Tarun Vir Singh, Advocate for the Respondent

**Final Decision:** Disposed Off

### Judgement

Jasbir Singh, J.

By filing this writ petition, the petitioners have laid challenge to policy decision dated 18th March, 2011 in seeking

regularization of services of daily wage/work charged employees with a stipulation that the employees be not given benefit of past service (notional

or otherwise). Further that petitioners be covered under the New Contributory Pension Scheme and not under the Pension Scheme which was in

existence prior to 01.01.2004. The petitioners have also prayed for quashing of similar condition incorporated in their appointment letter dated

16.12.2011 regularizing their service.

2. Above issue came up for consideration before this Court in Harbans Lal versus The State of Punjab and others, CWP No. 2371 of 2010

decided on 31st August, 2010.

3. On February 20th, 2014, following order was passed.

Notice of motion.

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counsel for the petitioners is directed to

supply him copies of the writ petition during course of the day.

Adjourned to 25.02.2014.

Mr. Gupta is directed to get instructions whether grievance raised by the petitioners is covered in their favour by ratio of a Division Bench

Judgment of this Court in the case of Harbans Lal v. The State of Punjab and others, (CWP No. 2371 of 2010), decided on 31.8.2010 (P5).

4. Sh. Dhuriwala, learned State counsel has candidly admitted that against the above order, SLP No. (C)....CC No. 11570 of 2012 was filed,

however, it was dismissed on 30th July, 2012. He further states that in that case, review application i.e. R.P. (C) No. 2038 of 2013 is pending.

5. Sh. Dhuriwala, has failed to show that the issue raised by the petitioners is not covered by the ratio of judgment in the case of Harbans Lal's

case (supra).

6. In view of the above, this writ petition is disposed of in terms of the judgment of Harbans Lal's case (supra).