



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

\*\*\*\*\*

**218**

**CWP-1726-2019**

**Date of Decision: 09.12.2025**

**DHIAN CHAND AND OTHERS**

...Petitioners

Vs.

**CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS**

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. R.K. Arora, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Prabhat K. Jalbera, Advocate and  
Mr. Shivam Ahuja, Advocate  
for the petitioners

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate  
for respondents

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of decision of Executive Committee taken in the meeting held on 19.09.2018 to the extent of denial of their regularization.

2. The petitioners are claiming that they are working with respondent for last more than two decades as Class-IV employees. They were terminated by respondent. They approached Labour Court which allowed their petition and ordered the respondent to reinstate them with back wages and continuity of service. The respondent preferred *CWP-21465-2013*, *CWP-21470-2013* and *CWP-21475-2013* before this Court which were dismissed vide order dated 10.12.2013. The respondent preferred *LPA-292-2014*, *LPA-293-2014* and *LPA-299-2014* before this Court which were dismissed by a Division Bench of this Court vide order

dated 23.09.2014. The petitioners gave up their claim for back wages and were reinstated. They are continuously working since their reinstatement. The respondent has regularized its Coaches, however, they are not. There is no ground of discrimination. If the posts of Coaches can be created, there is no reason to deny regularization to them on the ground of lack of sanctioned posts. Their claim is squarely covered by judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***"Jaggo v. Union of India and others"***, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826, ***"Shripal & Anr. Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad"***, 2025 (4) SLR 467 and ***"Dharam Singh and Others Versus State of U.P. and Another"***, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent, on being confronted with afore-stated facts and judgments of Supreme Court, submits that competent authority would reconsider claim of petitioners in the light of regularization of Coaches, if any, and afore-cited judgments of Supreme Court.

4. In the wake of statement of learned counsel for the respondent, the petition stands disposed of. Let the needful be done within six months from today. The respondent would be at liberty to examine whether petitioners are full-time or part-time employees. It is made clear that petitioners would not be treated as part-time merely on the ground that they are contractual/temporary/daily wage workers.

5. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)  
JUDGE

**December 09, 2025**  
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No