



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

113

CWP-9193-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.03.2026

Anil Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

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 petitioners in terms of their long service of more than 10 years on the post of Accounts Assistant with respondent No.2 and to decide the representation dated 13.01.2026 (Annexure P-9) filed by the petitioners for regularization (wrongly mentioned as "acquisition" in the prayer clause and head note of writ petition) of their services and to grant equal pay scales to the petitioners as per the regular pay scale from the date of their entitlement with all consequential benefits i.e. dearness allowance,



increments, notional seniority, fixation of pay, arrears along with interest @ 6% per annum from the date it became due till its actual realization.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the respondent/Department issued an advertisement dated 17.01.2012 (Annexure P-1) for engagement of Accounts Assistants on contractual basis. The petitioners, having applied pursuant thereto, were subjected to a written test and interview and came to be appointed vide order dated 07.06.2012 as discernible from Annexure P-3. He further submits that since the initial appointment of the petitioners, they have been continuously discharging their duties as Accounts Assistants without any break, and their services have been extended from time to time and in this way, they have completed more than 13 years of uninterrupted service. The petitioners possess all the requisite qualifications at par with regular Accounts Assistants and are working against sanctioned vacant posts. The work extracted from them is perennial in nature and indispensable for the functioning of respondent No.2, yet their services have not been regularized by the respondent/department. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners were granted annual increments @ 3% along with medical allowance under the Outsourcing Policy w.e.f. November, 2017, which reflects acknowledgment of their continuous service. The petitioners submitted representations dated 20.03.2023 and 13.01.2026 (Annexures P-8 and P-9, respectively) seeking regularization of their services, but the same



have not been considered or decided till date. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners' continuous engagement on contract basis is violative of the ratio of law as laid down 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 and another vs Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad*, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221, which recognizes the right of long-serving contractual employees to be considered for regularization.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the instant writ petition of the petitioners is treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2, appearing on advance notice, submits that they have no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision thereof by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the respondent No.2 is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the case of the petitioners and pass a speaking order in the light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo's case (supra)*, *Dharam Singh's case (supra)* and *Shripal's case (supra)*, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, 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 as per the judgments rendered by this Court in *Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab, CWP No.2371 of 2010* and *State of Haryana and others v. Jai Bhagwan, LPA No.1892 of 2019*.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.
6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the words "acquisition" mentioned in the prayer clause and headnote of the writ petition are inadvertent and the correct relief sought by the petitioners throughout the pleadings and representations is for "regularization" of their services.
7. This Court is satisfied that the petitioners' submission regarding the inadvertent use of "acquisition" instead of "regularization" is well-founded. The pleadings and representations (Annexures P-8 and P-9, respectively) clearly shows that the relief sought by the petitioners is for "regularization" and the typographical error shall not affect their claim.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.03.2026
yakub

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