



CWP-21963-2026

CNR NO: PHHC011175722026

1

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

(129)

CWP-21963-2026

Date of Decision : 20.07.2026

Hapreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Shailender Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Priya Bhati, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. This is the second round of litigation. Earlier, the petitioner had approached this Court, by filing a CWP-7306-2017, seeking relief to continue his services, which were discontinued way back on 22.03.2012, due to non-available of the budget.

2. The writ petition (supra), remained pending adjudication before this Court, for about 09 years, and ultimately, it was disposed of by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, by drawing an order dated 05.03.2026 (Annexure P-3), with a direction upon the respondent No.1, to decide the representation of the petitioner.

3. Thereafter, the representation of the petitioner was decided, by the Registrar, Punjabi University, Patiala (respondent No.1), by passing a speaking order dated 15.05.2026 (Annexure P-1), whereby, the relief sought



by the petitioner was declined. Fetching grievance from the said speaking order, the instant writ petition has been filed challenging the legality of the speaking order (supra).

4. What surfaced from perusal of the speaking order dated 15.05.2026 (Annexure P-1), is that the petitioner was appointed in the year 2009, as a Mali, on a daily wage basis (muster roll). His services were dispensed with on 22.03.2012, on account of non-availability of the budget. The respondent/authorities concerned, re-considered the case of the petitioner, and find that even at present, there is no specific provision of Budget, for the post of a Mali, on a daily wage (muster roll), and therefore, the claim of the petitioner for re-appointment cannot be considered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while challenging the legality of the speaking order (supra), submits that the respondents have acted in a manifestly discriminatory manner, as similarly situated Mali(s) were allowed to continue in service, even after the petitioner's services were dispensed with. To support this, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon an internal communication dated 22.05.2012 (Annexure P-5).

6. The aforesaid contention, however, merits rejection. The petitioner's plea of discrimination is misplaced for two reasons; firstly, the individuals cited in Annexure P-5, were attached to the Horticulture Department, and drawn against a distinct budgetary allocation specifically "Botanical Garden Temporary Labour/Work Charged Staff". Secondly, the said communication pertains to 22.05.2012, and the record so placed before this Court is bereft of any material to demonstrate that those workmen were actually retained thereafter. Neither any relevant document has been brought



CWP-21963-2026

CNR NO: PHHC011175722026

3

on record to substantiate that the said individuals are still continuing against the allocated budget under the relevant head.

7. In view of the above, no right, whatsoever, exists in favour of the petitioner, seeking re-employment. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **dismissed.**

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

July 20, 2026
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No