

CWP-8842-2019

-1-

2026:PHHC:068438



107

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

**CWP-8842-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.05.2026**

Sanjay

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ravi Gakhar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondent No.4-MC Bhiwani.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-6628-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short 'CPC') for placing on record Annexures P-26 & P-27 and also seeking exemption from filing true typed/certified copies thereof.

2. In view of the averments made in the application, same is



allowed and copy of the notification dated 18.06.2014 and the judgment dated 16.04.2026 rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024*** titled as ***Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** are taken on record as Annexures P-26 & P-27, respectively, subject to all just exceptions. Exemption sought is granted.

CM-6629-CWP-2026

3. This application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for listing the main petition for actual hearing.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner submits that on 02.04.2019, the main petition was adjourned *sine die* to await the decision of ***SLP-33265-2018*** titled as ***State of Haryana and others Vs. Yogesh Tyagi and another***. Now the controversy involved in the present petition stands settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Madan Singh***'s case (*supra*).

5. In view of the above, this application is allowed and the main petition is taken up on board for final disposal today itself.

CWP-8842-2019

6. Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* seeking quashing of action of the respondents regarding not regularizing the services of the petitioner, who is working with the respondent-Council since 28.08.2007 on the post of Stenographer-cum-Computer Operator and has completed more than 11 years on the said post. It is further prayed to issue a



writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner since 28.08.2007 along with all the consequential benefits.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Stenographer-cum-Computer Operator on 28.08.2007 on DC rate on the vacant post of Stenographer-cum-Computer Operator by duly constituted Selection Committee and he is continuously serving respondent No.4 for the last more than 18 years. As such, the petitioner fulfills the requisite criteria laid down by the Selection Committee, as culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh***'s case (*supra*).

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case his case is considered and decided by respondent No.4 by treating the present petition as a comprehensive representation, in a time bound manner in the light of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh***'s case (*supra*), by passing a speaking order after affording him an opportunity of hearing.

9. Learned counsel for respondent No.4-MC submits that case of the petitioner would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in ***Madan Singh***'s case (*supra*) and appropriate order would be passed by respondent No.4 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

10. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing



the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026 and **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-26) has been upheld. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under: -

“25. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of the High Court dated 31.05.2018 stands partly modified as under:

(a) It is held that Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 are valid and the judgment of the High Court to the extent it holds otherwise is set aside. The intervenors who are similarly situated and entitled to the benefit of the Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 shall be entitled to the reliefs flowing from such declaration, subject to verification by the competent authority.

xxx

xxx

xxx

(c) The employees, who had approached the High Court and who were granted liberty to take steps after the present batch of appeals were decided, are free to take appropriate steps in accordance with this judgment.”

11. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.4 to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) and pass a speaking order after affording him an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.



12. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

13. It is made clear that if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, he will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in ***Yogesh Tyagi***'s case (*supra*).

14. The pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

04.05.2026
vishnu

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No