



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

CWP-23889-2025

Date of decision: 19.08.2025

Gurbir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Dilraj Bhinder, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ranjit Kalra, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the order dated 19.02.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.5.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that a perusal of the appointment letter dated 08.12.2005 (Annexure P-2) would indicate that the petitioner was initially appointed as a Helper on *ad hoc* basis in the year 1993, in terms of Regulation 25 of the Punjab School Education Board (Employees Service) Regulations, 1988. As such, it cannot be claimed that the appointment of the petitioner was through backdoor entry. Further still, similarly situated counterparts of the petitioner have also approached this Court by filing CWP No.9248-2009, with a similar prayer wherein, vide order dated 01.08.2025 a Co-ordinate bench has directed the respondents therein to decide their claim within a period of 06 months. He further submits that the petitioner



has a legitimate claim for regularization on account of his continued and dedicated service in the respondents-Board. Reliance in this regard is placed on the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Jaggo Vs. Union of India**' 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826, '**Vinod Kumar and others Vs. Union of India and others**' (2024) 1 SCR 1230 and '**Shripal and another Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad**' Civil Appeal No.8157 of 2024 decided on 31.02.2025,

3. However, learned counsel for the petitioner limits his prayer to the extent that he be allowed to move a comprehensive representation to the respondents/competent authority with regard to his claim for regularization. He further prays that directions may be issued to the respondents/competent authority for decision of the said representation by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that he has no objection if the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is allowed.

5. In view of the discussion above, the present petition is disposed of and the petitioner will be at liberty to move a representation with respect to his claim for regularisation before the respondents/competent authority. In the event of the petitioner moving such a representation, the respondents/competent authority shall decide the same, in terms of **Jaggo's case(supra)** within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order by passing a speaking order, after affording him an opportunity to be heard. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondent.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

19.08.2025
Neha

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