



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

CWP-990-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.02.2026

Malkiat Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, by way of instant writ petition, as cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, prays for issuance of a Mandamus upon the respondents to grant him the benefit of regularization from the date when services of his junior (respondent No.8) were regularized, i.e. 18.05.2001.

2. On 19.01.2026, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner while referring to the Muster Roll/seniority list (Annexure P-1), submits that the date of joining of the petitioner was 01.02.1988, and he was granted the relief of regularisation w.e.f. 02.07.2003, therefore, he is at sr. no.904 in the aforesaid seniority list.

He further submits that one another Malkeet Singh, son of Kala Singh, who was at sr. no.988, having been appointed after the petitioner, i.e. on 01.04.1988, and was also granted regularisation



w.e.f. 04.11.2004. However, vide an order dated 10.03.2021, he was granted the relief of regularisation w.e.f. 18.05.2001. Therefore, the petitioner being senior and appointed prior to his junior Malkeet Singh, is entitled for a similar relief.

Notice of motion, at this stage, to respondents no.1 to 7 only.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents no.1 to 7, and waives service.

He seeks time to have apt instructions that under what circumstances, respondent no.8-Malkeet Singh, was granted regularisation, w.e.f. 18.05.2001, without considering the claim of his seniors like petitioner.

Adjourned to 12.02.2026.

To be shown in the urgent list.

It is made clear that no further request for an adjournment shall be entertained on the next date of hearing, on behalf of either of the parties.”

3. Learned State counsel, upon having instructions from Mr. Dinkar Gill, SDE, informs this Court that respondent No.8, has been erroneously granted the relief, as prayed for by the petitioner, and the order dated 10.03.2021 (Annexure P-3), is under re-consideration.

4. In view of the abovesaid statement made by learned State counsel, this Court is not required to delve any further into the matter. Accordingly, a Mandamus is issued upon the respondents, in the following terms:-

In the event, upon re-consideration, the order dated 10.03.2021 (Annexure P-3), vide which, services of



respondent No.8 have been regularized, w.e.f. 18.05.2001, is found to be correct, claim of the petitioner shall also be considered and decided, by passing a speaking order within four months therefrom.

5. With the abovesaid observations, the instant writ petition is disposed of.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

12.02.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No