



LPA-2393-2024

1

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

113

LPA-2393-2024

Date of decision: 10.03.2025

Raghubir Singh

... Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH**

Present:- Mr. Vivek Singla, Advocate for the appellant.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is appellant before us being not satisfied with the order dated 10.07.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP-17273-1998 titled as “**Raghubir Singh vs. State of Haryana and others**”. Admittedly, the petitioner as well as the respondents had retired long back. The claim of the petitioner is that he should have been regularize with effect from the date the respondent had been regularized i.e. 01.01.1987.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that if the appellant had been regularized from that he would have been placed over and above him in that seniority list of Fitter Grade-II. He filed earlier a writ petition in the year 1997, wherein, this Court directed him to make a representation that after the decision on his representation he again preferred a writ petition in the year 1998 which came up for hearing before the Court on 10.07.2024 when the learned Single Judge passed the order.

3. Learned counsel submits that there was no reason not to regularize him from 01.01.1987 as on the lower post he had been appointed prior to



LPA-2393-2024

2

respondent. Learned counsel submits that even the respondents have admitted that there was an error in not regularizing the appellant from 1987.

4. In service matters there is something as what we normally call as “**giving a quietus to ligation**”. Cases of regularization which were conducted in the year 1987 or in 1993 when the appellant was regularizes, cannot be reopened now after lapse of more than 25-30 years, as the regularization requires an exercise of going through the service record of an employee, we have no information and no documents and even asked from the respondents with regard to the service book of the petitioner *vis-à-vis* that of the respondent-petitioner/appellant. The learned Single Judge has noticed further that on account of the seniority granted to respondent No.4, no further benefit was given to him i.e. there was no further promotion awarded to him. In these circumstances, placement of respondent No.4 over and above the writ petitioner/appellant, did not result in causing any harm to the appellant. So far as this regularization from 1993 is concerned, we find that the same is now highly belated and by afflux of time, we do not find any reason to grant him any relief at this belated stage giving a quietus to litigation.

5. Dismissed.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

March 10, 2025

Kapil

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