

2025:PHHC:155962



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

278

Date of decision: 12.11.2025

1. CWP-29371-2017

Suresh Kumar and others		Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

2. CWP-29412-2017

Jitender Kumar and others		Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

3. CWP-2658-2018

Sanjay Kumar and others		Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

4. CWP-6273-2018

Sajjan Singh and others		Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

5. CWP-13220-2018

Amit Kumar and others		Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

6. CWP-13200-2019

2025:PHHC:155962



Sunil Dutt and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vikas Kuthiala, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in all the cases.

Mr. Arun Kumar Singla, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Puneet Jindal, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Rohit Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2 in CWP Nos.29371 and 29412 of 2017
and in CWP Nos.13220, 6273, 2658 of 2018.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Vide this common order, I intend to dispose of CWP Nos.29371 and 29412 of 2017, CWP Nos.2658, 6273 and 13220 of 2018 and CWP No.13200 of 2019, as common questions of law and facts are involved for adjudication. For the sake of convenience, facts are taken from CWP-29371-2017.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s), *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner(s) have been working with the respondent/Corporation for more than fourteen years. Their contractual employments were made in terms of the policy Instructions dated 01.09.2006, as amended from time to time, and they were being paid wages at D.C. rates fixed for Group-C and Group-D posts. Thereafter, the State of Haryana issued Instructions dated 04.02.2013 (Annexure P-2), revising the pay structure of contractual employees to *minimum of the pay band + grade pay + dearness allowance*. The

2025:PHHC:155962



respondent/Corporation implemented these Instructions, however, there arose a dispute regarding withdrawal of the initially granted pay benefits whereas the identically circumstanced employees were paid much higher wages as discernible from Annexure P-6. During the pendency of the writ petitions, the Government of Haryana notified the Haryana Kaushal Rozgar Nigam Limited (HKRNL) on 30.06.2022. Subsequently, the Haryana Contractual Employees (Security of Service) Act, 2024 (in short 'the Act of 2024') was notified on 06.12.2024. The Act of 2024, governs contractual employees engaged on *ad hoc* or outsourced basis in government organizations, with the objective of providing security of service and related matters. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that in view of the legislative mandate under the Act of 2024, the cases of the petitioner(s) are required to be considered thereunder. The petitioner(s) are fully eligible and around 3000 similarly circumstanced employees engaged by the respondent/Corporation and other power utilities have already been extended the benefit of the said Act.

3. *Per contra*, learned Senior Counsel for respondent No.2 submits that the Act of 2024 was adopted by the respondent/Corporation and other power utilities on 11.08.2025, and necessary steps are being taken to give effect to its provisions. He submits that the cases of the petitioner(s) shall be duly considered and appropriate orders shall be passed in terms of the Act of 2024 within a period of three months from today.

2025:PHHC:155962



4. In view of the statement made by learned Senior Counsel for respondent No.2, the present writ petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondent/Corporation to consider the cases of the petitioner(s) and pass appropriate orders in accordance with the Act of 2024, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.
5. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.
6. It is, however, made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy and all the questions of fact and law are left open to be determined by the competent authority while passing the speaking order in accordance with law.
7. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

12.11.2025
yakub

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