

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

2025.PHHC.164191



**CWP No.21579-2022(O&M)
Date of Decision:27.11.2025**

Dharamvir Singh and others

....Petitioners

VS.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Nafeesh Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Addl. A.G., Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of order dated 05.09.2022 whereby their claim for re-enrollment was rejected.

2. The petitioners joined Haryana Home Guards as Volunteer. The petitioner No.1 served for 14 years and No.2 and 3 served for two years. They were terminated without show cause notice and opportunity of hearing. They filed spate of representations seeking re-enrollment. On 12.10.2018 they approached respondent No.2 by filing an appeal against their termination. The respondent No.2 sought report from respondent No.3. The respondent No.2 vide order dated 27.08.2021 directed the respondent No.3 to reinstate the petitioners. They were not reinstated thus, submitted representation dated 14.02.2022 to respondent No.2. They served legal notice dated 16.03.2022 for compliance of order dated 27.08.2021. They



preferred CWP-11626-2022 before this Court. The said petition was disposed of vide order dated 26.05.2022 with the direction to respondents to decide legal notice within three months. The respondent by impugned order dated 05.02.2022 rejected their claim. The respondent No.3 has enrolled 7 out of 11 candidates who were ordered to be reinstated vide order dated 05.08.2021 passed by Commandant General Home Guards and Director Civil Defence Haryana. The respondent has rejected claim of petitioners on the ground that Home Guards is an organization of volunteers. People of all classes and different walks of life are given opportunity. The members cannot be retained over a long period of time because it erases voluntary character of the organization and suggests that unemployed persons are retained over a long period.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that respondent has considered case of many similarly situated candidates for re-enrolment. Petitioner may also be reconsidered.

4. Learned State counsel submits that Competent Authority would reconsider case of petitioners, if any other candidate has been re-enrolled after passing of impugned order.

5. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of. Let the needful be done within three months from today.

6. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

27.11.2025
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No