



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

102

CWP No.10335 of 2019Date of Decision: **27.05.2026**

Kusum and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. G.S.Gopera, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Addl.AG, Haryana

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. By way of instant writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* seeking directions to the respondents to regularize their services with all consequential benefits in terms of the regularization policy of the Government of Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were appointed during the years 2012 to 2014 on various posts including Laboratory Technician and Laboratory Attendant in Bhagat Phool Singh Medical College for Women, Khanpur Kalan, District Sonapat. It is contended that their appointments were made against sanctioned posts after following the transparent process of selection pursuant to publication of advertisement. It is further argued that the petitioners have been continuously discharging their duties to the satisfaction of



the authorities and are performing the same nature of duties as are being performed by regular employees. Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that the State Government had framed policies dated 16.06.2014, 09.07.2014, 14.08.2014 and 20.08.2014 for regularization of Group 'C' and Group 'D' employees engaged on contractual/ad-hoc basis against sanctioned posts. It is argued that the petitioners fulfill all the requisite conditions under the aforesaid policies and are, thus, entitled to consideration for regularization. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners fulfill the requisite criteria, as culled out by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024* titled as *Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*. He further relies upon the judgments rendered by this Court in *Daljeet Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another*, CWP-5684-2026 decided on 23.04.2026 as well as *Neeraj Rani and others v. State of Haryana and others*, CWP-35408-2025 decided on 18.04.2026.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners would be satisfied in case their case is considered and decided by respondent No.2 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 an opportunity of hearing to them.

4. Learned State counsel submits that case of the petitioners 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.2 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.



5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the file, it transpires that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026, **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) being the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 of the State 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.”

6. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to examine the case of the petitioners in terms of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) and pass a speaking order after affording them an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the petitioners.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.05.2026
'om'

Whether speaking/reasoned. :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable. :

Yes/No