



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

116

**CWP-7831-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.03.2026**

Rajan Sharma

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ankush Rampal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner and further direct the respondents to decide the representations dated 25.02.2026 and 23.02.2026 (Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively) submitted by the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially appointed by respondent No.2 on a contractual basis to the post of Junior Draftsman on 21.02.2014. Since the date of his initial appointment, the contractual engagement of the petitioner has been extended from time to time without any break for a period of about 12 years. The petitioner submitted detailed representations dated 25.02.2026 and 23.02.2026 to the



respondent/authorities seeking regularization in view of the settled law, but no decision has been taken on the same till date. He further submits that the work being extracted from the petitioner is perennial in nature and is at par with regularly appointed employees. Reliance has been placed on the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaggo v. Union of India and others, 2025 AIR SC 296***, and the judgment of this Court in **CWP-35744-2025** titled as ***Anoop Singh vs. State of Punjab and others*** decided on **23.12.2025**.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the representations dated 25.02.2026 and 23.02.2026 (Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively) filed by the petitioner are decided by respondent(s)/competent authority by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to the respondent(s)/competent authority for time-bound consideration and decision of the representations dated 25.02.2026 and 23.02.2026 (Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent(s)/competent authority is directed to consider the representations dated 25.02.2026 and 23.02.2026 (Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order, 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(s)/competent authority.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

16.03.2026
yakub

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