



119

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

CWP-10579-2026

Date of decision: 08.04.2026

Mukesh Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Chander Pal Tiwana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate
for the respondents.

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 *certiorari* for quashing/setting aside the impugned order dated 20.11.2015 (Annexure P-15) passed by respondent No.2. Further, for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners along with all consequential benefits in view of regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-1). Further, for directing the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioners dated 20.02.2026 (Annexure P-6) by passing a speaking order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that the petitioners were directly appointed by the respondents on contractual basis on the post of Assistant Lineman (ALM) between the year 2006 and 2009. The dates of the appointment of the petitioners and their particulars are given in



CWP-10579-2026

-2-

para 2 of the writ petition. The petitioners have put in more than 19 years of continuous service, and perennial work is being extracted from them, which is indispensable to the functioning of the respondent Nigam. The petitioners are discharging duties identical to those performed by their regular counterparts. He further relies upon the judgments rendered 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 & Anr. v. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221** and submits that the petitioners are entitled to be regularized in terms of the regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-1) and also on the basis of the aforementioned judgments.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has limited his prayer to the extent that the present petition be treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided in a time bound manner by passing a speaking order after affording the petitioners an opportunity of being heard.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate puts in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent(s) and submits that the grievance raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition would be considered by passing a speaking order in accordance with the law by the respondents.

6. Therefore, in view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of and the respondents are directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the claim of the petitioners in terms of the aforementioned 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 respondents.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
Neha

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