



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

121

CWP-8778-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.03.2026

Dilbag Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. A.P. Bhandari, Advocate
with Ms. Bhargavi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus*, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner from the date of his eligibility as per the regularization policies issued by the State of Haryana from time to time and in view of the judgment passed in *Jaggo vs Union of India and others, 2024 SCC (Online) SC 3826* and the judgment rendered by this Court in CWP-31304-2025, titled as *Joginder Singh vs State of Haryana and others*, decided on 31.12.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially engaged as a Chowkidar on daily wage basis



on 28.01.2002 against a vacant sanctioned post. His services were illegally terminated in November 2003, which led to filing of an industrial dispute whereby an award dated 11.05.2006 has been passed reinstating the petitioner with continuity of service and full back wages. In pursuance thereof, the petitioner was reinstated and he has since been working continuously without any break. He further submits that the State of Haryana framed a policy dated 18.06.2015 for regularization of Group-C and Group-D employees, providing that those who had completed three years of service as on 28.05.2014 were entitled to be regularized. The said policy was subsequently quashed by this Court, against which the State preferred an SLP wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed an order directing maintenance of *status quo* on 26.11.2018. During the subsistence of the said order, the respondent/Corporation itself sought details of daily wage employees vide communication dated 05.08.2025 and the petitioner's particulars were duly forwarded reflecting his continuous service. Despite fulfillment of all eligibility conditions and long uninterrupted service, the petitioner's claim for regularization remains unconsidered, even though he submitted a detailed representation dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-5), which is still pending without any decision. It is thus argued that the inaction of the respondents is arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the perennial work is being extracted from the petitioners at par with their



regular counterparts. In support of the arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaggo v. Union of India and others 2025 AIR SC 296, Vinod Kumar and others v. Union of India (2024) 1 SCR 1230, Shripal & Anr. v. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221*** and ***Dharam Singh and Others v. State of U.P. and Another 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735.***

2.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the representation dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner is 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 respondents No.2 and 3, 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 of the representation dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioner and pass a speaking order in terms of the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaggo's case (supra), Vinod Kumar's case (supra), Dharam Singh's case (supra)***, 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 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.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

23.03.2026
yakub

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