



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

Date of decision: February 09, 2026

(1) CWP-2000-2026

RAJIV SIWACH AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

(2) CWP-3167-2026

RAJESH KUMAR AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-2000-2026).

Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-3167-2026).

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petitions have been filed seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularise the petitioners' services from the date of their initial appointment on their respective posts in view of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.14831 of 2024 titled *Jaggo v. Union of India*, and grant them all consequential benefits including seniority, pay fixation and arrears of salary.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that at this stage, the petitioners will be satisfied in case they are permitted to make a fresh

representation before respondent no.3, raising the grievance as has been raised in these petitions, and the same may be ordered to be decided within a specified period in light of the judgment in *Jaggo* case *ibid*. All relevant particulars of the applicants' service which entitle them to the claimed benefits will be mentioned therein.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State, and submits that in case any such representation is filed by the petitioners within four weeks from today, the same will be decided by respondent no.3/Director General Higher Education, by passing a speaking order thereupon in accordance with law taking into consideration the judgment in *Jaggo* case *ibid*. within six months of receiving the representation.

5. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioners have no objection to the petitions being disposed of in terms thereof.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. In case the order is not passed within the stipulated period, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioners.

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

February 09, 2026
Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

✓

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*