

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).19389/2006

(From the judgement and order dated 20/10/2005 in CWP No.  
9164/2005 of The HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH)

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

AAD RAM

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and permission to file  
addl. documents and with prayer for interim relief and office  
report )  
(for final disposal)

Date: 30/09/2008 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALTAMAS KABIR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MARKANDEY KATJU

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Manjit Singh, AAG.  
Mr. T.V.George, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Manu Mridul, Adv.  
Mr. G.P. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Surya Kant, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

ORDER

Delay condoned.

This petition is directed against the judgment and final  
order dated 20th October, 2005 passed by the Punjab and Haryana  
High Court in C.W.P. No.9164 of 2005, whereby the petitioner  
had claimed regularisation of his services on the ground that he  
had put in 240 days of  
SC19389/06

-2-

service during several years beginning from 1991. It has been  
pointed out by Mr. Manjit Singh, counsel appearing for the  
petitioners, that according to the policy of the State Government if  
a daily wager has worked as Pump Operator for a period of three  
years prior to 31/1/96 his services would be deemed to be  
regularised with effect from 31/1/96 in the light of the decision  
referred to in the judgment of the High Court. The services of the  
workman, who was working as a daily wager in the Forest  
Department of the State Government was retrenched with effect  
from 14th May, 2004 against which the respondent-workman  
moved the High Court.

Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties  
and also having regard to the fact that the petitioner has been  
working since 1981 and also having regard to the decision of this  
Court in the case of U.P. State Electricity Board Vs. Pooran  
Chandra Pandey and others, 2007(11) SCC 92, which has been  
very fairly produced by Mr. Manjit Singh, appearing for the  
petitioners, we see no reason to interfere with the judgment and

order of the High Court and the special leave petition is,  
accordingly, dismissed.

There will, however be no orders as to costs.

(Sheetal Dhingra)  
Court Master

(Juginder Kaur)  
Court Master