



109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-11158-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.05.2026

Anju Bhandari

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Rohan Moudgil, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.2 & 3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-6727-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking revival of the main petition in view of the order dated 16.04.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024* titled as *Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*.



2. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner submits that on 23.02.2023, the main petition was adjourned *sine die*, as the regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3) was under consideration of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Now the controversy involved in the present petition stands settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Madan Singh**'s case (*supra*).

3. In view of the above, this application is allowed and the main petition is taken up on board for final disposal today itself.

CWP-11158-2020

4. Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* seeking setting aside the order dated 27.07.2020 (Annexure P-12), vide which the petitioner was terminated without any reason and further to direct the respondents to regularize her service in terms of the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3).

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Data Entry Operator against a sanctioned vacant post on 25.07.2008 and since then, she is continuously working in the offices of respondents No.2 & 3. She has been given extension every year and there is no complaint against her. She has completed more than 17 years of services. As such, the petitioner fulfills the requisite criteria, as culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh**'s case (*supra*).

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the



petitioner would be satisfied in case her case is considered and decided by respondent No.3 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 her.

7. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 & 3-HSVP submits that case of the petitioner 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.4 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026 and **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3) 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.”

9. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3-Chief Administrator, Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh**’s case (*supra*) and pass a speaking order after affording her 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 petitioner.

10. Needless to say, if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, she will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in **Yogesh Tyagi**’s case (*supra*).

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

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

04.05.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No