

**Ongoing Cases involving of Cooperation Department Govt. of Haryana/Sugarfed.**

Sr.No.	Organisation	Case Title	Status		Remarks
			Reply Filed/not filed	Next date of Hearing	
<b>AR, Sugar Mills Branch</b>		<b>CIVIL WRIT PETITIONS/CM</b>			
1.	Sugarfed/Hafed	<p>i)CWP No 3974 of 2007 - Karambir Singh &amp; others Vs. State of Haryana &amp; others(FCC, MD, Sugarfed, Liq. Sirsa S/M &amp; Hafed) .  <b>Claim:</b>                      Reg. adjustment of retrenched seasonal employees of Sirsa Sugar Mill.</p> <p>CM. No. 4375 &amp; 4376 of 2015 in CWP No. 3974 of 2007.  <b>Claim</b>                      To dispose of the writ petition No.3974 of 2007 in light of judgment/order dated 28.1.15 passed in CWP No.17837 of 2006 titled as 'Bhim Sain and others.</p> <p>ii)CWP No 23957 of 2013 – Dilawar Singh Vs. State of Haryana &amp; others.                      iii)CWP No 21191 of 2016 – Gram Panchayat, Phaphrana Vs. State of Haryana &amp; others.  <b>Claim</b>                      To provide employment to the residents of Vill. Phaphana in Assandh Sugar Mill as per terms &amp; conditions of Govt. order/ notification reg.allotment of land for setting up of Assandh Sugar Mill.</p>	<p>Reply on behalf of Resp.No.1 &amp; 2(FCC &amp; Sugarfed) filed on 28.8.2007</p> <p>Reply on behalf of respondents filed on 30.5.16.</p>	<p>29.3.2017</p> <p>Sh.P.K. Mutneja, Adv. engaged by AG, Hry.</p>	<p>Came up for hearing on 04.9.2009. Interim orders were passed. Admitted. Directions are being complied with by all the Coop. Sugar Mills.                      Writ petitions filed by the Residents/Gram Panchayat of Vill. Phaphrana(related to Hafed) have been clubbed with CWP No.3974 of 2007, which came up for hearing on 8.2.17 and directions have been issued to ACS, Coop./competent authority for taking action against Assandh Sugar Mill.</p>
2.	Sugarfed	<p>i)CM No.8810 of 2016 in CWP No.17837 of 2006 – Bhim Sain &amp; others Vs. State of Haryana  <b>Claim:</b>                      CM filed by Sugarfed for seeking clarification regarding adjustment of ex-employees of Bhuna Sugar Mill who had taken benefit of VRS from purchaser.                      ii)CMs(11 Nos.) filed by Employees Union of Palwal Sugar Mill for recalling/ modification to the extent of filling up the</p>	<p>Reply to all CMs have been prepared and to be filed recently by the counsel.</p>	<p>20.2.2017</p> <p>Sh.C.S.Ba kshi, AAG engaged by AG, Hry.</p>	<p>CM was listed for hearing on 12.8.16 and adjourned to 20.2.17.</p>

		posts by promotion.			
3.	Sugarfed/Panipat Sugar Mill	<p>i)CWP No 20676 of 2006 - Joginder Singh Vs. FCC &amp; others.</p> <p>ii) CWP No.8760 of 2007 – Suraj Bhan Singh &amp; others Vs. FCC &amp; others.</p> <p><b>Claim</b> Against the order dated 12.5.2006 of MD/RCS(SM) by which resolutions No. 4 &amp; 5 dated 28.2.2006 passed by BOD, Panipat Mill were rescinded. FCC vide order dated 15.12.2006 upheld the order dated 12.5.2006 of RCS(SM). Vide above resolutions, large number of seasonal/contractual employees were regularised.</p>	<p>Reply on behalf of Resp.No.2 (Sugarfed) filed on 28.3.2007/30.7.2007. Copy sent to Govt. for information.</p>	<p>Last date of hearing on 04.8.2009.</p> <p>Sh.P.K. Mutneja, Adv. engaged by AG, Hry.</p>	<p>Both the cases have been clubbed being similar cases. After 4.8.09, cases have not been listed for hearing.</p>
4.	Sugarfed	<p>CWP No. 8528 of 2015- Lok bhali Insaf welfare Society . Vs. Union of India etc.</p> <p><b>Claim:</b> Reg.release of Cane payment to farmers by the Punjab &amp; Haryana Sugar Mills for crushing season 2014-15.</p>	<p>Affidavit on behalf of Govt.(PS, Coop.) filed on 8.5.2015. on 9.9.15, Cane Commissioner, Haryana was also intimated that all Coop. Sugar Mills have paid entire cane payments, for apprising the Hon'ble High Court.</p>	<p>3.3.2017</p> <p>Sh.Sandeep Moudgil, AAG on behalf of Govt.</p>	<p>Directions have been complied with.</p>
5.	Panipat Sugar Mill	<p>i) CWP No. 3960 of 2014- Nahar Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana &amp; others CM No. 1138-39 of 2015</p> <p>ii) CWP No.21377 of 2013- Dhan Singh &amp; Ors. Vs. State of Haryana C.M.No.5446 of 2015.</p> <p><b>Claim:</b> To regularize the services of petitioners working on contract basis as per resolution No.5 passed in mills BOD meeting dated 28.2.2006 and order dated 12.5.2006 of the RCS(SM) giving direction while rescinding the above resolution.</p>	<p>Reply on behalf of respondent No.2 &amp; 3(Sugarfed &amp; Panipat Sugar Mill) filed on 10.10.2014. Respondent No.1(Govt.) is proforma party. No need to file reply as directed by the Govt.</p>	<p>20.3.2017</p>	<p>Both the cases have been clubbed being similar cases.</p>

6.	Panipat Sugar Mill	CWP No. 15675 of 2015 – Sugar Mill Mazdoor Sangh, Panipat Vs. State of Haryana & ors. <b>Claim:</b> To grant LTC & Education Allowance.	Reply on behalf of respondents No.3 & 4 filed on 5.7.2016, copy of which has been sent to ACS, Coop. & FD for adoption.	02.3.2017 Case is being defended by Panipat Sugar Mill.	
7.	Panipat	CWP No. 13497 of 2016 – Joginder Singh & ors. Vs. State of Haryana & ors. CM No.8563 of 2016 <b>Claim:</b> To quash the order for adjustment of ex-employees of Bhuna Sugar Mill and give promotion to petitioners. CM for granting stay on adjustment of ex-employees of erstwhile Bhuna Sugar Mill	Reply to be filed by Panipat Sugar Mill on behalf of respondent No.2 & 3(MD, Sugarfed & MD, Panipat Mill). Respondent No.1(Govt.) is proforma party. No need to file reply as intimated by the Govt. to the AG, Hry.	20.4.2017. Case is being defended by Panipat Sugar Mill	Hon'ble High vide interim order dated 13.7.16 has clubbed this case with CWP No.1458 of 2016 – Arvind Kumar & others Vs.State of Haryana & others being similar case. Vide letter No.2289 dated 25.7.16 & reminders dt.10.8.16, 26.8.16, 1.9.16, 6.9.16, 27.9.16, 24.10.16 & 9.1.17, MD, Panipat Sugar Mill has been requested to file reply well in time after getting the same vetted from this office.
8.	Rohtak	CWP No. 12871 of 2015 – The Coop. Sugar Mills Employees Association, Rohtak Vs. State of Haryana & ors. <b>Claim:</b> To grant LTC & Education Allowance.	Reply on behalf of all respondents 1 to 3 filed on 10.5.16 by mill after getting the same vetted from AG, Haryana.	27.2.2017. Case is being defended by Rohtak Sugar Mill	
9.	Rohtak/Karnal Sugar Mills	i) CWP No. 4915 of 2012-Mahender Singh Phogat,Cane Acctt. Vs Haryana Sugar Fed. & others. ii) CWP No.5939 of 2012-Prabhu Dayal, Cane Acctt. Vs Haryana Sugar Fed. & others <b>Claim:</b> To grant basic pay of Rs.14980 + 3300 G.P.	Reply on behalf of respondent No.1 filed on 27.11.2015. Govt. is not the party.	15.5.2017. Cases are being defended by Rohtak/ Karnal Sugar Mills	Both the cases have been clubbed being similar cases. Cases came up for hearing on 20.5.16. Counsel for the petitioner sought time for filing replication to written statement filed on behalf of respondent No.1.
10.	i)Karnal/Sugarfed ii)Panipat	i)CWP No. 1458 of 2016 – Arvind Kumar & ors. Vs. State of Haryana & ors. ii)CWP No. 23587 of 2016 – Mazdoor Sangh (Regd.)Panipat Vs. State of Haryana & ors.	Reply on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3(Sugarfed & Karnal Sugar Mill)	20.4.2017.  Sh.C.S.Ba kshi, AAG, engaged	The Hon'ble High Court vide Interim order dated 27.5.16 directed that in the meantime, respondent No.2 & 3 shall not make appointment from outside.

	iii)Shahabad	iii)CWP No.24545 of 2016 – Gurnam Singh Vs. State of Haryana & others. <b>Claim:</b> To quash the order for adjustment of ex-employees of Bhuna Sugar Mill and give promotion to petitioners. <b>CM</b> CM in CWP No.1458/2016 filed by Sugarfed for modification of order dated 27.5.16 and granting liberty to respondents No.2 & 3 to make fresh appointment in light of directions/order dated 28.1.15.	filed on 27.5.16. Revised draft reply on behalf of Respondent No.1(Govt.) has been filed on 8.9.16.	by the AG, Haryana. Sh.P.K.M utneja, Adv. on behalf of sugar mill.	This office has engaged counsel Sh.Charanjit Singh Bakshi, AAG through AG, Haryana for filing application(CM) for vacation of stay and defending the case. Writ petitions at Sr.No.ii) & iii) have been clubbed with CWP No.1458 of 2016.
11.	Karnal	CWP No.5246 of 2015 – Sugar Mills Karamchari Union, Karnal Vs. State of Haryana <b>Claim:</b> To grant LTC & Education Allowance.	Reply on behalf of respondents No.3 & 4 filed on 25.2.16. Draft reply on behalf of respondent No.1 & 2 i.e. ACS, Coop. & FD has been sent to Govt. for approval and filing.	10.3.2017 Case is being defended by Karnal Sugar Mill	
12.	Shahabad	CWP No. 3401 of 2016 – Chini Mills Mazdoor Union, Shahabad Markanda, Kurukshetra Vs. State of Haryana & ors. <b>Claim:</b> To grant LTC & Education Allowance.	Reply on behalf of respondents No.2, 3 & 4 has been filed. Respondent No.1(Govt.) is proforma party. No need to file reply as directed by the Govt.	9.3.2017 Case is being defended by Shahabad Sugar Mill	
13.	Kaithal	i).CWP No. 10665 of 2015 – Krishan Kumar & ors. Vs. State of Haryana & ors.  ii)CWP No.12780 of 2011 – B.N.Tiwari & ors. Vs. State of Haryana & ors.(Attached with CWP No.10665 of 2015. <b>Claim:-</b> Against reduction of Grade Pay.	i) Govt. is proforma respondent. ii)Reply on behalf of resp. No.2 & 4 filed on 18.12.2011.	17.2.2017 Case is being defended by Kaithal Sugar Mill	Both the cases have been clubbed being similar cases.
14.	Gohana	CWP No. 18657 of 2015-Uday Bhan & ors.	Reply on behalf	2.3.2017	

		<p>Vs. State of Haryana &amp; ors.  <b>Claim:</b>  To regularize the services of petitioner (seasonal) on the post of fitter –II regular from the date of Junior has been regularized.</p>	<p>of respondent no. 2&amp;3 has been filed on 12.4.2016 by Deepak Balyan AAG. Govt. is proforma party.</p>	<p>Case is being defended by Gohana Sugar Mill</p>	
<b>Estt. Branch</b>					
15.	Sugarfed	<p>CWP No. 8586 of 2000- Haryana Coop. Sugar Mills Officers Association Vs State of Haryana &amp; ors.  <b>Claim:</b>  Reg. revision of pay scale of officers of Coop. Sugar Mills Ltd., Panipat, Rohtak, Meham, Kaithal, Bhuna.</p>	<p>Reply filed on 15.11.2000</p>	<p>Pending Admitted.</p>	
16.	Sugarfed	<p>CWP No. 6165 of 2010- Vijender Singh and others V/s State of Haryana.  <b>Claim:</b>  Filed by Labour Welfare Officers of Sugar Mills regarding retirement age from 58 to 60 yrs</p>	<p>Reply filed on 13.12.2010</p>	<p>Pending Admitted.</p>	
17.	Sugarfed	<p>CWP No.929 of 2013- R.P.Sanghi V/s State of Haryana &amp; ors.  <b>Claim:</b>  Filed by a retired employee of this Sugarfed(retrenched from MITC) for granting retiral benefits i.e. DCRG and payment of enhanced earned leave.</p>	<p>Reply filed on 22.8.2013.</p>	<p>6.2.2017 Decided.</p>	
18.	Sugarfed	<p>CWP No.12519 of 2014- S.B. Agnihotri V/s State of Haryana &amp; Ors.  <b>Claim:</b>  Filed by retired employee of sugar Fed. for deposit of equal matching contribution in PF Account.</p>	<p>Reply filed on 10.4.2015</p>	<p>6.4.2017</p>	