

2025:PHHC:008589



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH.**

205

**CWP-16774-2013 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.01.2025.**

JASWANT SINGH AND OTHERS

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

PRESENT: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaivir Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. Ashish Rawal, Advocate, for respondent No.1/UOI.

Mr. K.K. Gupta, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 to 4/FCI.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J (ORAL)

Prayer made in the instant writ petition is for directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment on regular basis vis-à-vis the other employees who were much junior to the petitioner.

2 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.2 to 4/FCI contends that the issue as regards the regularization of contract labour engaged by FCI was subject matter of consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Food Corporation of India Workers Union Regd. No.8219 through its Organizing Secretary Vs Union of India and**

2025:PHHC:008589



others, bearing SLP (Civil) No.19218-2016 decided on 31.07 2017 and that the Food Corporation of India had been permitted to engage employees on contractual basis. A notification was thereafter issued to engage the labour through contractual employment which such notification has already been upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court. He contends that under the given circumstances the prayer of the petitioner made in the present petition would not be sustainable since the policy decision of the respondents/FCI already stands affirmed by the Hon'ble Apex Court.

3 Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that in case there is any policy shift by the respondents/FCI, the claim of the petitioner may be considered.

4 I find that the aforesaid prayer is pre-mature at this stage since no such steps/proceedings have been initiated by the respondents/FCI and in case any such policy is notified by the respondents/FCI, the same has to be examined on the strength of the eligibility and conditions provided thereunder and that the petitioner would, in any case, be entitled to take recourse to his remedies against the said policy if the grievance of the petitioner is not redressed.

5 The present petition is accordingly disposed of as having been rendered infructuous, at this stage.

January 21, 2025.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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