

CWP- 10686-2026(O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

131

CWP-10686-2026(O&M)
Date of decision: 08.04.2026

Tajinder Singh & ors.

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others


... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. PS Jammu, Advocate and
Mr. Dhruv Bishnoi, Advocate and
Mr. Gaurav Luhani, Advocate,
for the petitioners.


HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners as Firemen as they were appointed on 29.06.2012 and since then they are working regularly on contractual appointment and their case is squarely covered by the judgment dated 25.08.2025 rendered by this Court in CWP No.10146 of 2023 ***titled as "Manjeet Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others"***, wherein the services of similarly situated employees were regularized, in the interest of justice and fitness of things. Further, directing the respondents to count the past service and to grant other benefits to the petitioners as per judgment rendered by this Court in CWP-2371-2010



titled as "**Harbans Lal Vs. State of Punjab**", and LPA No.1892 of 2019 "**State of Haryana and others Vs. Jai Bhagwan**".

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that the petitioners were appointed as Firemen in Municipal Committee Samrala on contractual basis on 29.06.2012 and have been continuously working since then. There was a regularization policy dated 18.03.2011 to regularize the contractual/daily wage employees and as per Clause 2(i) of the said policy, the employee was qualified for regularization w.e.f. 01.04.2011 or after completion of 3 years of contractual service, whichever is later. The petitioners have completed three years service as per the aforesaid policy, but they were not regularized. Subsequently, State of Punjab has enacted the Punjab Ad hoc, Contractual, Daily Wage, Temporary, Work Charged and Outsourced Employees Welfare Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as '2016 Act'), which also provides that after completion of 3 years of service, the employee is to be regularized. The case of the petitioners was recommended for regularization by the Nabha Improvement Trust under the 2016 Act vide resolution dated 30.12.2016. Further the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by the judgment dated 19.12.2018 in CWP-11427-2016 '**Sukhjad Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab & anr.**' and **Manjeet Singh's case (supra)**, wherein the similarly situated employees were regularized and granted benefit of the past service. Further, this Court in CWP-12434-2022 titled as '**Akash Sharma Vs. State of Punjab & ors.**', decided on 13.02.2026, has already examined the issue and held that without any repeal, 2016 Act is still



CWP- 10686-2026(O&M)

-3-

enforceable. The petitioners served legal notice dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-3), but no action has been taken.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that at this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied, if the legal notice dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) submitted by them is decided by respondent No.2, by passing a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing, in a time bound manner and in the light of the aforesaid cited judgments.

4. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, present petition is disposed of and respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide the legal notice dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) in the light of the judgments rendered by this Court in **Sukhjad Singh's case (supra)**, **Manjeet Singh's case (supra)** and **Akash Sharma's case (supra)** and pass a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

5. Further, the decision taken on the legal notice dated 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) shall be conveyed to the petitioners.

6. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted to them forthwith by the competent authority.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

08.04.2026
monika

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