176 (15 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

DECIDED ON: 24.12.2025

CWP-8351-2024

RATTANA

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-27623-2025

SONU AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-27926-2025

NAZIR SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-28165-2025

GIAN SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-28866-2025

RAMESHO DEVI

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

ANURADHA
2025.12.24 06:48
I agree to specified
portions of this document

CWP-30565-2025

SATYAWAN **.....PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-31815-2025

PARAMJEET SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-32088-2025

SAT PAL @ GOPI

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-32211-2025

PREM SINGH PREMA

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-32939-2025

ANIL AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-34282-2025

JASBIR SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

ANURADHA
2025.12.24 06:48
I agree to specified
portions of this document

CWP-3741-2025

RAJBIR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-5592-2025

RAJBIR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-37061-2025

SATBIR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-28398-2025

SURESH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Vikram Sheoran, Advocate
Ms. Alka Sheoran, Advocate
Ms. Sandeep Kaur, Advocate
Mr. Ajay Chaudhary and
Mr. S.B. Kaushik, Advocate
Mr. A.P. Bhandari, Advocate with
Ms. Bhargavi, Advocate
Mr. G.S. Gopera, Advocate
Mr. Deepak Sonak, Advocate
Mr. Aman Nain, Advocate with
Mr. Rishab Arora, Advocate
Mr. Dharmveer Phour, Advocate
for the petitioner(s)

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. AG. Haryana

ANURADHA
2025.12.24 06:48
I agree to specified
portions of this document

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

Vide this common order, this Court intends to dispose of all the above-said petitions, as a common question of law is involved therein. For brevity, the facts are being taken from CWP-8351-2024.

Facts

Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner joined service with the respondent Department in the year 1996 as a Baildar-cum-Mali and has been continuously litigating for protection and regularization of his service due to repeated illegal terminations by the respondents. The petitioner initially filed CWP No. 1085 of 2005 seeking regularization of his services. This Court, vide order dated 31.05.2005, directed the respondents to decide the representation made by the petitioner; however, no effective action was taken by the respondents in compliance with the said order. The services of the petitioner were thereafter terminated on 22.12.2008. Aggrieved, the petitioner raised an industrial dispute, which culminated in an award dated 28.12.2011 (Annexure P-1) in his favour, though without grant of back wages. Challenging the denial of back wages, the petitioner filed CWP No. 12806 of 2012, which was allowed by this Court vide order dated 24.04.2018 (Annexure P-2). The respondents preferred an LPA against the said order; however, the same was withdrawn on 28.02.2019 (Annexure P-3), thereby attaining finality. Once again, the services of the petitioner were terminated on 01.10.2014. The petitioner approached the learned Labour Court, which passed an award dated 29.09.2016 (Annexure P-4) in favour of the petitioner. The said award was challenged by the respondents by filing CWP No. 14087 of 2017, which remains pending before this Court as on 05.08.2024. In the said proceedings, since the petitioner had already attained the age of superannuation, his reinstatement was stayed; however, the respondents were directed to pay 50% back wages. During the intervening period, the State of Haryana formulated a regularization policy dated 01.10.2003 for Group-D

ANURADHA
2025.12.24 06:48
I agree to specified
portions of this document

employees who had completed three years of service (Annexure P-5). Being fully eligible under the said policy, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 06.05.2012 seeking regularization of his services (Annexure P-6), but no favourable decision was taken. The petitioner thereafter filed CWP No. 1150 of 2021, which was decided by this Court on 13.10.2023 (Annexure P-8) with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization. In compliance thereof, the petitioner submitted a detailed representation dated 08.11.2023 (Annexure P-9) along with a copy of the Court order. However, the Division Forest Officer, Kaithal, rejected the petitioner's representation vide order dated 05.12.2023 (Annexure P-10), without properly appreciating the facts, the applicable policy, and the binding judicial precedents. Aggrieved by the said rejection, the petitioner filed CWP No. 1389 of 2024, which was withdrawn on 06.02.2024 with liberty to file a fresh petition with better particulars. It is pertinent to mention that similarly situated workmen approached this Court seeking regularization of their services. Their writ petitions were allowed, the LPAs filed by the Department were dismissed, and ultimately the Special Leave Petitions preferred by the respondents were also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-11). The petitioner's claim for regularization is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgments of this Court and the Supreme Court. Despite being similarly situated and fully eligible, the petitioner has been denied regularization in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner, compelling him to approach this Court by way of the present writ petition.

Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner, appointed in 1996 as Baildar-cum-Mali, is entitled to regularization under the policy dated 01.10.2003, having rendered long service and succeeded in multiple litigations

ANURADHA
2025.12.24 06:48
I agree to specified
portions of this document

against illegal terminations. The rejection of his claim is arbitrary and discriminatory, especially when similarly situated workmen have been regularized and such decisions have attained finality up to the Supreme Court. He has placed reliance upon the judgment dated 23.12.2025 passed by this Court in CWP-26643-2025 and other connected cases titled as '***Manoj Kumar vs. State of Haryana and anr.'*** and seeks parity with them.

On behalf of the State

Learned State Counsel categorically states that the reply filed in CWP-26643-2025 and other connected cases titled as '***Manoj Kumar vs. State of Haryana and anr.'*** be considered as written statement in all the matters mentioned above as no separate reply is required to be filed since common question of law and facts is involved therein. He further points out that this Court has already allowed the CWP-26643-2025 and other connected cases vide order dated 23.12.2025. He does not controvert the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioners are at parity with the petitioners in CWP-26643-2025.

Conclusion

In light of the above, the facts of the instant petitions are squarely covered by the decision of this Court passed in **Manoj Kumar's case (supra)**, hence, the same are allowed in the same terms as in CWP-26643-2025.

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

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file(s) of connected case(s).

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

24.12.2025
anuradha

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

ANURADHA
2025.12.24 06:48
I agree to specified
portions of this document