



128

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

CWP-9696-2026

Date of decision: 01.04.2026

Har minder Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Pepsu Road Transport Corporation

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. S.S. Salar, Advocate
for the petitioners.Mr. Hardeep Singh Saini, Advocate
for the respondent-PRTC (through V.C.).**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to treat the petitioners as regular and pass a formal order, regularizing the services of the petitioners w.e.f. the date of initial appointments after adding a period of 18 months on account of requirement of rules.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that the petitioners were employed as Conductors and Drivers against the sanctioned posts between the year 2008-2011. The petitioners were selected pursuant to a transparent process initiated by issuance of an advertisement and the work and conduct of the petitioners remained satisfactory. Thereafter, the petitioners were under the direct contract of the respondent-Corporation since 03.01.2017 as discernible from Annexure P-1. The petitioners have been continuously

**CWP-9696-2026****-2-**

serving the respondent Corporation and have discharged perennial duties at par with those performed by regular employees. Further, the post on which the petitioners are working had been classified as operation staff in terms of Regulation 4 of PRTC Conditions of Appointment and Service Regulation, 1981. The petitioners submitted a representation dated 06.11.2025 (Annexure P-2) but no action has been taken so far. Further, the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by the judgments of this Court in CWP No.8240 of 2008 titled as '*Dalbir Singh and others Vs. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation and another*', CWP No.12211 of 2021 titled as '*Hansraj and others Vs. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation*' decided on 03.09.2025; CWP No.30455 of 2025 titled as '*Jagtar Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another*' decided on 15.10.2025 and CWP No.35975 of 2025 titled as '*Gurmail Singh Vs. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation*' decided on 03.12.2025.

3. He further relies upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '*Jaggo v. Union of India and others*' 2025 AIR SC 296 and '*Dharam Singh and Others v. State of U.P. and Another*' 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would be satisfied if the representation/legal notice (Annexure P-2) of the petitioners is decided by the respondent by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to the respondent for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation of the petitioners by passing a speaking order.

6. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel

**CWP-9696-2026****-3-**

for the petitioners, the respondent is directed to consider the representation/legal notice (Annexure P-2) of the petitioners in terms of the above mentioned judgments and pass a speaking order, after affording them an opportunity to be heard, 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 the respondent.

7. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

01.04.2026*Neha*

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