



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CWP-17957-2024(O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.07.2026

Rajesh Sharma

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

Krukshetra University and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Sube S.Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. A.S.Virk, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J.

CM No.10755-CWP-2026

Instant application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for preponement of the date of hearing and final disposal of the writ petition, which is listed for hearing on 10.09.2026.

Learned counsel for applicant/petitioner submits that SLP filed by the State of Haryana against Division Bench judgment rendered in ***CWP No.17206 of 2014 (Yogesh Tyagi and another v. State of Haryana and others)*** has been dismissed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court and the controversy in hand has finally been adjudicated vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 rendered in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024 titled as Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** arising directly out of ***Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)***. He thus prays for preponement of the date the writ petition and to decide the same in terms of the abovesaid judgment.

Notice of the application.



Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate appearing for Mr. A.S.Virk, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and raises no serious objection in case the date of hearing in the writ petition is preponed and the main case is taken up for hearing for today itself for final disposal.

In view of the above, the application is allowed and with consent of learned counsel for both the parties, the abovenoted writ petition is taken up on board for final decision for today itself.

CWP-17957 of 2024

1. Prayer in the present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *Mandamus*, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner on the post of Workman/Helper/Beldar under the policy dated 01.10.2003 issued by the State of Haryana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that the petitioner would be satisfied in case his case is considered and decided by the respondents in the light of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Madan Singh's case (supra)*, by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to them.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that case of the petitioner would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in *Madan Singh's case (supra)* and appropriate order would be passed by the respondents in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.
4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that Hon'ble the



Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026 and **Madan Singh's case (supra)** is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 has been upheld. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under: --

“25. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of the High Court dated 31.05.2018 stands partly modified as under:

(a) It is held that Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 are valid and the judgment of the High Court to the extent it holds otherwise is set aside. The intervenors who are similarly situated and entitled to the benefit of the Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 shall be entitled to the reliefs flowing from such declaration, subject to verification by the competent authority.

xxx xxx xxx

(c) The employees, who had approached the High Court and who were granted liberty to take steps after the present batch of appeals were decided, are free to take appropriate steps in accordance with this judgment.”

5. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's case (supra)** and pass a speaking order after affording him an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

6. Needless to say, if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, he will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in **Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)**.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

July 13 , 2026.
'om'

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