



CWP-6603-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

105

CWP-6603-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision :10.03.2026

**Union Territory, Chandigarh Administration
and others**

...Appellants

Versus

Leelu Ram and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Ms. Madhu Dayal, Addl. Standing Counsel with
Mr. Varun Sandhu, Advocate for appellant-U.T. Chandigarh.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 15.10.2025 (Annexure P/4) passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal') by which, the benefit of regularization of service has been extended by the Tribunal in favour of respondent No.1, who has been working with the petitioners-U.T. Chandigarh for more than three decades.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners argues that respondent No.1 was not working on full-time basis with the petitioners and rather he was working on part-time basis and though, the grant of benefit of regularization of service to such an employee is not envisaged under the rules governing the service but, without appreciating the said fact, the



CWP-6603-2026 (O&M)

-2-

benefit of regularization has been extended by the Tribunal in favour respondent No.1 from the date of eligibility, which is incorrect.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record with her able assistance.

4. A finding has been recorded by the Tribunal that as far as back in 2006 vide Diary No.782 dated 30.03.2006, the case of respondent No.1 was recommended by the petitioners themselves for full-time appointment. Once, the said recommendation was made by the petitioners themselves which fact has gone unrebutted at the hands of the petitioners, it cannot be said that the work for which the respondent No.1 was appointed, was only a stop-gap arrangement or there was no requirement with the petitioners of respondent No.1 performing the said duty of sweeper as a full-time employee.

5. Further, as per the settled principle of law settled by this Court in **CWP-10238-2017 titled as Jeewan Lata vs. State of Punjab and others decided on 10.05.2019**, it has already been held that in case, a part-time worker continues to perform his/her duties with an institution for decades, it cannot be said that the job being performed by such a worker is a stop-gap arrangement or that full-time duties are not required or even that such work is not essential for the working of such institution. The applicability of the said judgment in the facts and circumstances of the present case has gone unrebutted at the hands of the petitioners.

6. Further, as per the settled principle of law which has already been noticed by the Tribunal including the recent judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Civil Appeal No.14831-2024 titled as, Jaggo vs.**



CWP-6603-2026 (O&M)

-3-

Union of India & others, decided on 20.12.2024, Civil Appeal No.8158-7179 of 2024 titled “Shripal and anr. Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad” decided on 31.01.2025 as well as *Dharam Singh and others versus State of U.P. and another decided on 19.08.2025,* it has already been held that in case a worker has worked for more than one decade, the judgment in the case of *Secretary, State of Karnataka vs. Uma Devi and others, 2006 (4) SCC 1,* will be applicable for consideration of his/her claim for regularization of service.

7. In the present case, it is a conceded fact before this Court that the respondent No.1 has worked with the petitioner-department for more than three decades. Once, the petitioners themselves recommended the case of respondent No.1 for full-time appointment keeping in view the requirement of his services as far back as in 2006, coupled with the fact that he had worked for more than three decades as well as as per the settled principle of law cited hereinbefore, the direction given by the Tribunal for regularization of service of respondent No.1 is not proven to be perverse or illegal to the facts on record or law. Hence, no interference at the hands of this Court is called for and writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

March 10, 2026

aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No