

2026:PHHC:091261



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106

COCP-3015-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.07.2026

Rohit Sharma and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Anurag Rastogi and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. Nischal Chetanya Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioners.

VIKAS SURI, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for initiating proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, for alleged wilful disobedience of the decision dated 20.05.2026 (Annexure P-1) passed by this Court in CWP-24207-2019, the operative part of which reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners claim to be covered under the policy dated 18.06.2014 as well as by the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 1996 of 2024 titled Madan Singh and Others vs. State of Haryana and Others, along with a bunch of connected appeals and seeks consideration of their claims in terms thereof.

Learned State counsel submits that he has no objection to the aforesaid proposal put forth by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Accordingly, Respondents/Competent Authority, is directed to examine the individual claims for regularization of the petitioners and adjudicate the



same in light of the principles laid down in Madan Singh's case (supra), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and by passing a speaking order. A copy of the speaking order so passed shall be supplied to the petitioners within one week thereafter.

It is further clarified that all the pleas raised in the present petition and the grounds taken therein shall be duly considered at the time of adjudication of the petitioners' case and before passing the speaking order."

2. On an advance copy of the petition having been furnished, Mr. Naveen Bhardwaj, Addl. AG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondents and submits that the petitioners have been called for a personal hearing for individual consideration of their cases for regularization, in deference to the aforesaid order. The said factum is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners.

3. In the light of the above, the present petition is disposed of at this stage. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to seek revival of the present petition in case any grievance still remains.

July 07, 2026
sumit.k

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

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