



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

119

CWP-26707-2026

Date of Decision: 21.08.2026

BALA DEVI AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

VERSUS**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Arvind Kumar Chauhan, Advocate for the
petitioners.

Mr. Naveen Panwar DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. This civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of *Certiorari* for quashing the impugned action of the respondents in not regularizing the services of the petitioners with effect from 12.05.2005, i.e. the date on which their juniors were regularized, and further seeking issuance of a writ of *Mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners with effect from 12.05.2005 along with all consequential benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed as Class-IV Part-Time employees during

CNR No: PHHC011399252026

2026.PHHC:116812



the period from 1991 to 2002 (Annexure P-1) and were subsequently regularized between 2011 and 2018 (Annexure P-2 and P-3). He submits that employees junior to the petitioners, namely Bhup Singh and Ram Niwas, were granted regularization with effect from 12.05.2005, which orders were upheld by this Court vide orders dated 22.07.2008 and 24.02.2026 (Annexures P-4 and P-5). It is further contended that similarly situated employees have also been granted the benefit of regularization with effect from 12.05.2005 vide order dated 17.10.2025 (Annexure P-6). Learned counsel argues that the petitioners, being senior and similarly situated, cannot be denied the same benefit, particularly when the respondents have extended such benefit to their juniors and other similarly situated employees. Despite repeated representations, the grievance of the petitioners has not been redressed. He further submits that the petitioners were constrained to serve a Legal Notice dated 10.07.2026 (Annexure P-7), which has also elicited no response or consequential action from the respondents. Thus, the continued denial of regularization to the petitioners with effect from 12.05.2005 is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of the principles of equality and parity.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners at this stage submits that he would be satisfied if a direction is issued to respondent No.2/competent authority to decide the legal notice dated 10.07.2026 (Annexure P-7) in the light of Annexures P-4 to P-6, by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Notice of motion.

CNR No: PHHC011399252026

2026.PHHC:116812



5. Mr. Naveen Panwar, learned DAG, Haryana, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2/competent authority to hear and decide the legal notice dated 10.07.2026 (Annexure P-7), by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

6. In view of the limited prayer made by counsel for the petitioners without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of and respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to hear and decide the legal notice dated 10.07.2026 (Annexure P-7), filed by the petitioners in the light of Annexures P-4 to P-6 in a time bound manner and pass a speaking order, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

7. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same be granted to them forthwith by respondents/competent authority.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

21.08.2026

parul verma

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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