



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

216

CWP-26341-2021

Date of Decision : May 16, 2025

JASWINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

***VERSUS***

PUNJAB MANDI BOARD AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA**

Present : Mr. B.D.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.S.Sidhu, Advocate for respondents No.1 to 3.

\*\*\*

**DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)**

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 21.9.2021 (Annexure P-14) passed by respondent No.1 whereby, the claim of the petitioner for regularization of his services has been declined.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was appointed on contract basis through a Service Provider. Various representations were submitted by the petitioner for regularization of his services, however, no action was taken by respondent No.2. As a consequence of this, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that from the year 2000 to 2015, the petitioner was employee of respondent No.1, therefore, the respondents be directed to regularize the services of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 submits that the petitioner was never an employee of the answering respondents. He submits that infact the petitioner was appointed on contract basis through the Service Provider, as such, there is no relationship of master and servant between the petitioner and the answering respondents. As such,

there is no illegality in the impugned order passed by respondent No.1 dated 21.9.2021 (Annexure P-14).

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the record.

6. A perusal of the writ petition shows that infact no document has been produced by the petitioner to show that the petitioner was an employee of the respondents at any stage. A perusal of the stand taken by respondents No.1 to 3 in the written statement would show that it is a specific stand of respondents No.1 to 3 that the petitioner was never their employee and infact the petitioner was appointed on contract basis through a Service Provider and not by the respondents.

7. Taking into consideration the abovesaid facts, it is clear that the petitioner was never an employee of respondents No. 1 to 3. Infact, as per the stand of respondents No.1 to 3, the petitioner was employed through a Service Provider. In view of the above fact, it is held that there is no relationship of the master and the servant between the petitioner and respondents No.1 to 3, as such, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order dated 21.9.2021 (Annexure P-14) vide which, the claim of the petitioner for regularization of his services has been rejected.

8. In view of the above, there is no merit in the present writ petition, the same is, hereby, dismissed.

**(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)**

**JUDGE**

**May 16, 2025**

ajay-1

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes

Whether Reportable. : Yes/No