



131

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

CWP-844-2025

Date of Decision: 15.01.2025

RAVINDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

**UNION TERRITORY CHANDIGARH DEPARTMENT OF  
PERSONNEL AND OTHERS**

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present : Mr. Gurcharan Dass, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate with  
Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate  
for respondents No.1 to 3.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to continue him on the post of Basketball Coach (outsource) upto the age of 65 years.

2. The petitioner joined respondent in 2019 through outsource agency as Basketball Coach. He has attained the age of 60 years and respondent does not want to continue him because employees of the respondent retire on attaining the age of 60 years.

3. Mr. Gurcharan Dass, counsel for the petitioner submits that as per communication dated 06.08.2018 (Annexure P-9), an employee may be retained upto the age of 65 years. He can be retained even after his retirement though subject to outer age of 65 years.



4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and waives service.

6. With consent of learned counsel for the parties, the case is taken up for final disposal.

7. Learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 3 submits that letter dated 06.08.2018 (Annexure P-9) does not provide that every employee should be retained upto the age of 65 years. The petitioner is an outsource employee and Management has decided to engage another employee through outsource.

8. I have heard the arguments of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

9. The petitioner has no right to claim retention beyond 60 years. In any case, he was engaged through outsource agency, thus, he is not a regular employee of the respondent. He is claiming that similarly situated employees have been permitted to continue even beyond 65 years.

10. The petition stands disposed of with a direction to respondent to consider claim of petitioner in the light of similarly situated employees. This order shall not be construed as direction of this Court to respondent to retain the petitioner beyond 60 years of age.

**( JAGMOHAN BANSAL )**  
**JUDGE**

15.01.2025

*Ali*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No