
Date of Decision: 12.12.2025

...Petitioner

Versus

...Respondents

And

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner(s)	Respondent(s)
2.	CWP-24734-2017	Davinder Kumar	Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and Others
3.	CWP-24739-2017 (O&M)	Naresh Kumar Attri and Others	Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and Others
4.	CWP-23510-2017	Dharambir and Others	Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and Others

Present:- Mr. Barjesh Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner (Through V.C.).

Mr. M.S. Batth, Advocate
for respondents No.1 to 3
in **CWP-24739-2017** and **CWP-23510-2017**.

Mr. Aman Kumar, Advocate
for respondents No.1 to 3
in CWP-18013-2017 and CWP-24734-2017.

Ms. Perna Malhotra, Advocate for
Mr. Prateek Mahajan, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in **CWP-24734-2017.**

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-18013-2017**.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communication dated 08.07.2015 whereby his claim for regularization has been rejected.

3. The petitioner indubitably is working with respondents as Class IV Employee since 01.01.2000. He is working without break as daily wage worker.

4. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that claim of petitioner is squarely covered by judgment of this Court in '***Dildeep Singh and Others Versus Municipal Corporation and Others***', **2025(3) SLJ 178**. He further relies upon judgment dated 14.11.2025 of this Court in ***CWP No.20096 of 2021*** titled as '***Arvind Rana and Others Versus Union of India and Others***'.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submit that Municipal Corporation has challenged judgment of this Court in ***Dildeep Singh (Supra)*** by way of ***LPA No.2933 of 2025***, nevertheless, if directed by this Court, the Competent Authority would consider case of petitioners in the light of recent judgments

6. From the perusal of interim order dated 18.11.2025 passed by Division Bench of this Court in ***LPA No.2933 of 2025***, it appears that stand of respondent-Corporation before the Division Bench is that regularization policy is applicable to Class C and D Employees where Single Judge has ordered to regularize Class B Employees.

7. In the instant case, the petitioner(s) are Class IV Employees. Their case is squarely covered by judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in

‘Jaggo Versus Union of India’, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826 as well as
aforecited judgments of this Court.

8. The petitions stand ***disposed of*** with a direction to
respondent to consider case of petitioner(s) in the light of aforecited
judgments and pass an appropriate order within six weeks from today. It
is made clear that respondent shall not endeavour to reject claim of
petitioner(s) on one or another technical ground.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.12.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No