



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

115

**LPA-794-2025 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 22.07.2025.**

Vijay Kumar Arora

....Appellant.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate and
Mr. Akash Lather, Advocate for the appellant.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

CM-1999-LPA-2025

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 02 days in preferring the appeal.

Issue notice in the application to non-applicant/respondents.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice of application on behalf of the respondents.

Heard. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 02 days in preferring the appeal is condoned.

LPA-794-2025

The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench dated 22.01.2025, whereby the Civil Writ Petition No.19733 of 2003 preferred by him seeking regularization w.e.f. 1986 has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant was appointed on work charge basis in the year 1981 and, therefore, he was entitled to regularization w.e.f. 1986 when he had completed five years of service as per the policy/instructions of the respondents dated 19.12.1974 (Annexure P-3).

3. Heard.

4. The appellant is stated to have been appointed on work charge basis with the respondents in the year 1981. He had worked on various posts including those of Steno-Typist, Baildar, Motor mate and Store Chowkidar from 01.09.1981 to 31.08.1986. The appellant had approached this Court by way of preferring CWP No.618 of 1998 which was dismissed. Against dismissal of this writ petition on 15.10.1999, he had preferred SLP No.9623 of 2000 and the Supreme Court, vide order dated 08.03.2002 (Annexure P-9), had directed the respondents to consider the case of the appellant for regularization in terms of the applicable policy. In pursuance to the order passed by the Supreme Court on 08.03.2002, the case of the appellant was considered for regularization and his services were regularized w.e.f. 2002 in terms of the policy/instructions of the respondents dated 23.01.2001. Aggrieved thereagainst, the appellant had preferred Contempt Petition (C) No.373 of 2002 before the Supreme Court alleging disobedience and non compliance of the order passed by the Supreme Court on 08.03.2002. The Supreme Court found no merit in his contempt petition and opined that there has been due compliance of the order passed by the Supreme Court. The relevant extract of the order of the Supreme Court is reproduced hereunder:-

“The appellant is directed to work out his rights pursuant to the order made by the Government which is stated to have been made in compliance with the order made by this Court. We find that there is due compliance of the order made by this Court and, therefore, no further orders are required. The contempt petition is disposed of accordingly. Further proceedings in contempt shall stand dropped and notice in contempt shall stand discharged.”

5. In view of the above, it is patent that services of the appellant have been rightly regularized w.e.f. 2002. The appellant has not been able to point out any person who is similarly situated and was regularized prior to him.

6. Consequently, the appeal being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

22.07.2025
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No