



104+230

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CM-15975-CII-2025 IN/AND  
COCP-3454-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 20.08.2025

Baljinder Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Senu Duggal and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN**

Present: Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Balwinder Singh, AAG, Punjab.

**HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J. (Oral)**

**CM-15975-CII-2025**

1. Application for placing on record compliance affidavit on behalf of respondent No.2 is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

**Main case**

2. The instant petition has been filed for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for willfully disobeying the directions passed by this Court vide order dated 08.04.2025 (Annexure P-1), passed in CWP-5996-1999.

3. As per order dated 08.04.2025, the following direction was issued:-

*“12. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the present writ petition is allowed with the direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners for regularization of their services keeping in*



*view the observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Prem Singh's case (supra)** and **Jaggo's case (supra)** and if the claim is covered, relief be granted."*

4. It is the case of the petitioners that though speaking order dated 30.06.2025 (Annexure P-3) has been passed but claim of the petitioners has been rejected.

5. Respondent No.2 has filed reply by way of affidavit dated 04.08.2025 of Prabhat Garg, Manager, Punjab Financial Corporation, Chandigarh, wherein, it is held that case of the petitioners has been considered. Relevant portion of the same is as under:-

*"8. That as per the above iterated operational part of the judgment, direction was issued to consider the claim of the petitioners and if the claim was covered the relief was to be granted. In compliance of the said directions, claim of the petitioners in view of the judgments in Prem Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh & others (SLP(C) No.4371 of 2011) as well as Jaggo v. Union of India & others (SLP(C) No.5580 of 2024) was considered by the department at length, when the facts of the petitioners claim were applied to the said judgments passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court it was found that the claim was not covered."*

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners does not wish to file rejoinder to the compliance affidavit filed on behalf of respondent No.2.

7. The legality of the speaking order dated 30.06.2025 passed by the respondents cannot be considered in the present petition.

8. As such, the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner avail alternate remedy, as per law.

9. Rule stands discharged.



10. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

**20.08.2025**

*atulsethi*

**[HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN]  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking / reasoned :

Yes

No

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No