



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.211

(1) LPA-2066-2019(O&M)
HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LTD.
& ANOTHERAppellants
Versus
JAI BHAGWANRespondent

(2) LPA-2075-2019(O&M)
HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LTD.
& ANOTHERAppellants
Versus
SAT NARAIN AND ORS.Respondents

Date of Decision: 17.11.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Advocate for the appellant(s)
in LPA-2066-2019 and LPA-2075-2019.

Mr. J.K. Goel, Advocate for the respondent in
LPA-2066-2019.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate,
Ms. Preet Agroa, Advocate for the respondents
in LPA-2075-2019.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. These two appeals arise out of the order dated 21.05.2019 passed by the learned Single Judge in *CWP No.25868-2015 and CWP No.8043 of 2016*, respectively, whereby, the learned Single Judge has extended the benefit of regularization to the respondents/writ petitioners at par with their juniors.
2. Undisputedly, the respondents-writ petitioners were appointed as T/Mate on 03.01.1978 and their services came to be regularized in February, 1992 by the respondent authorities. They were further promoted to the post of Helper Grade-2 and Helper Grade-1. It

inspires that some of the juniors of the respondents/writ petitioners,



namely, Maha Singh and Balwan Singh made a representation in the year 2006 claiming regularization from 1991. Their representation was allowed. Based upon such claim, one Ved Singh Malik filed a writ petition in the year 2010, which too was allowed. Claiming parity with their juniors, the benefit of regularization from previous date has been allowed in favour of the writ petitioners. Thus, aggrieved, the appellant-department is before us in the present appeal.

3. An objection is taken in the present appeal to the judgment of learned Single Judge on the ground that it has already been implemented and that the appeal otherwise has been filed belatedly, alongwith an application to condone the delay of 1080 days in filing the present appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant does not dispute the fact that persons junior to the writ petitioners were regularized in the year 1991 and as a consequence to the order of the learned Single Judge, the writ petitioners have been granted parity in the matter of regularization from the date such benefit was granted to their juniors. The only ground pressed is that the claim of the writ petitioners was belatedly instituted.

5. We are not much impressed by the contention so advanced, inasmuch as, the challenge was made by the writ petitioners to the impugned action of the appellant by filing the writ petition in the year 2015, which has been allowed in the year 2019. The order of the learned Single Judge has also been implemented long back.

6. In such circumstances, we do not find any occasion to interfere in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case after implementation of the judgment and long lapse of time since then.



- 7. Consequently, these two appeals are hereby dismissed.
- 8. Pending application(s), if any, is/are also disposed of accordingly.
- 9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

November 17, 2025
Anjal

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes	/	No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes	/	No