



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

231

CWP-4763-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.07.2026

Pratap Ram

....Petitioner

Versus

Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Arvind Galav, Advocate
and Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Virk, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the impugned Order/Memo No.EN-8/21/PF-1957/1641 dated 22.09.2021 (Annexure P-15). Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for regularization in terms of the regularization policy dated 07.03.1996 (Annexure P-5) as modified vide Instructions dated 18.03.1996 (Annexure P-6) from the date when the similarly situated persons junior to the petitioner were regularized and grant all consequential benefits including seniority, promotion etc. to the



petitioner from the date when juniors to him were regularized and promoted to the post of Assistant.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially appointed in the year 1993 and he was directed to report for duty in the office of the Registrar from the office of of Peon, Students Welfare as discernible from Annexure P-2. Prior to that, the petitioner has worked as a Beldar on daily wage basis as is evident from Annexure P-1. The petitioner has served the respondent/University from 10.01.1992 to 11.10.1993, however, his claim for regularization has not been considered whereas certain juniors to the petitioner have been regularized and later on, his claim for regularization has been rejected in a mechanical manner by passing the impugned order dated 22.09.2021 (Annexure P-15). Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the Full Bench judgment of this Court ***Tek Chand and others vs State of Haryana and others, 2001(3) SLR 770*** (Annexure P-7) and the judgment of this Court passed in **CWP-18878-2013**, titled as ***Rambag and others vs Kurukshetra University and others***, decided on **01.02.2016**.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has rendered satisfactory and unblemished service while discharging the duties and perennial work is being extracted from the petitioner at par with his regular counterparts. The petitioner is neither engaged as a part-time worker nor as a casual labourer. There has been



no complaint or adverse remarks against the petitioner. The petitioner's continuous engagement on contract/daily wage basis is violative of the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others, 2026 INSC 379, Jaggo vs. Union of India, 2024 INSC 1034*** and ***Shripal vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad, 2025 SCC Online SC 221***.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the instant writ petition of the petitioner is treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided by respondent – University/competent authority by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent – University/competent authority for time-bound consideration and decision thereof by passing a speaking order.

6. In view of the above, the impugned order dated 22.09.2021 (Annexure P-15) is set-aside, however, considering the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent – University/competent authority is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the case of the petitioner and pass a speaking order in the light of ***Tek Chand's case (supra)*** and ***Rambag's case (supra)***, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. 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 respondent – University/competent authority.

- 7. Disposed of, accordingly.
- 8. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
yakub

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