



101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-11628-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.05.2026

Ashish Chauhan and others

... Petitioners

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 petitioners.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.2 to 5.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-6887-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 applicants-petitioners submits that on 10.08.2020, the main petition was adjourned *sine die*, as the regularization policy dated 16.06.2014 (Annexure P-10) was under consideration of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Now the controversy involved in the present petition has been 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-11628-2020

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 *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners in terms of the policy dated 16.06.2014 (Annexure P-10).

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed as MBA Interns vide appointment letter(s) dated 19.04.2011 (Annexure P-2) and they joined on the said post. Since their appointment, they are continuously working in the offices of respondent-Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (for short 'HSVP') and have completed more than 15 years of services. Further, the petitioners fulfill the requisite criteria, in view of ratio of law culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh***'s case (*supra*), as such, they are entitled to regularization of their services.

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

2026:PHHC:069232



petitioners would be satisfied in case their case for regularization 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 them an opportunity of hearing.

7. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 6-HSVP submits that case of the petitioners would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) and appropriate order would be passed by respondent No.3 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

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 has decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026, of which **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 16.06.2014 (Annexure P-10) 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

2026:PHHC:069232



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, HSVP 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.

10. Needless to say, if case of the petitioners is considered favourably, they 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

05.05.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No