



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 118

CWP-5415-2026
Decided on: 25.03.2026

Rajbala . . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

PRESENT: Mr. Nitin Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularise the petitioner’s services 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 along with interest at the rate of nine per cent per annum.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the petitioner will be satisfied in case she is permitted to make a fresh representation before the respondents raising the grievance as has been raised in this petition, and the same may be ordered to be decided within a specified period.

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 petitioner within four weeks from today, the same will be decided by respondent no.4-Director General, Secondary



Education, by passing a speaking order thereupon in accordance with law by 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 petitioner has no objection to the petition 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 petitioner.

25.03.2026

Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Yes/~~No~~
~~Yes~~/No