



126

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

CWP-6921-2026

Date of decision: 09.03.2026

Rajiv Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate and
Mr. Anuj Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. S. S. Parmar, Advocate and
Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioners in terms of their long service of more than 10 years on the post of Data Entry Operator as per the settled principle of law. Further, for issuance of directions to the respondents to consider and decide the representations dated 09.01.2026 (Annexure P-13) before respondent No.2 for regularization of services and also to grant equal pay scale to the petitioner as per the regular pay scale applicable for the post of Data Entry Operator to the employee of the State of Haryana w.e.f. date of their entitlement and all consequential benefits including dearness allowances increment and notional seniority along with interest @ 18% per annum from retrospective effect and due date till actual payment.



CWP-6921-2026

-2-

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that petitioners have been continuously working for more than 13 years against a sanctioned post and perennial work has been extracted which is indispensable for the functioning of the respondent-authority. Further, 38 posts are lying vacant and petitioners are also denied the equal pay for equal work in spite of performing the identical duties at par with the regular counterparts. Moreover, similarly situated employees have been regularized and the denial of the same relief to the petitioners amounts to hostile discrimination. The petitioners submitted a representation on 09.01.2026 (Annexure P-13) which remained unheeded. He further relies upon the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Jaggo v. Union of India and others' 2025 AIR SC 296, 'Dharam Singh and Others v. State of U.P. and Another' 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735 and 'Shripal & Anr. v. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad' 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has limited her prayer to the extent that the present petition be treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided in a time bound manner by passing a speaking order after affording the petitioners an opportunity of being heard.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana and Mr. S. S. Parmar, Advocate & Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate put in appearance and accept notice on behalf of the respondent-State and respondent No.2, respectively.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the grievance raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition would be considered by



CWP-6921-2026

-3-

passing a speaking order in accordance with the law by respondent No.2.

7. Therefore, in view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of and respondent No.2 is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the claim of the petitioners in terms of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo's case*, *Dharam Singh's case* and *Shripal's case (supra)* and pass a speaking order after affording them an opportunity to be heard, 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 petitioners. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.2.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

09.03.2026

Neha

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