



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

112

**CWP-25586-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 01.09.2025**

**Preet Karan Singh****....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Union of India and others****....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

----

**Present:** Mr. Mayank Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)**

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order dated 06.09.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal'), by which, the benefit of regularization of service was denied to the petitioner herein which is causing him prejudice.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is working since the year 2008 and as of now, he has rendered 17 years of service and keeping in view the settled principle of law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Civil Appeal No.14831 of 2024** titled ***Jaggo vs. Union of India and others***, decided on 20.12.2024 as well as the direction given in **Civil Appeal No.8157 of 2024** titled ***Shripal and another vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad***, decided on 31.01.2025, the respondents are under obligation to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization of his services.



CWP-25586-2025 (O&M)

-: 2 :-

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Aman Bahri, Advocate along with Mr. Shubham Pathania, Advocate accepts notice of behalf of the respondents No.2 to 5.
5. Learned counsel for the respondents No.2 to 5 submits that in case any representation is received from the petitioner giving the details of his appointment, the same will be considered in light of the judgments in ***Jaggo's case (supra)*** and ***Shripal's case (supra)***, an appropriate order will be passed by the competent authority within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of any such representation and in case, it is found feasible to grant the relief to the petitioner, the same will be granted otherwise, due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioner, which reasons will be conveyed to the petitioner for his information and necessary action.
6. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not want to press the instant petition and the same may kindly be disposed of as such.
7. Dismissed as not pressed.
8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

**(VIKAS SURI)**  
**JUDGE**

**September 01, 2025**  
*Varinder*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes  
Whether reportable : No