



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

112

CWP-11430-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.04.2026

Hari Chand and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Gavrit Mittal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus*, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners on their respective Class IV posts w.e.f. 01.10.2003, in view of the regularization policy dated 01.10.2003 (Annexure P-3) along with all consequential benefits in the light of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Vinod Kumar and others v. Union of India and others, (2024) 1 SCR 1230, Shripal and others vs Nagar Nigam Gaziabad and others*** and the judgment passed in ***Jaggo vs Union of India and others, 2024 SCC Online (SC) 3826*** and in the light of the judgment passed by this Court in **CWP-4436-2026**, titled as ***Poonam and another vs State of Haryana and another***, decided on 13.02.2026.



2. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were initially appointed on different Class IV posts with respondent No.2. The State Government issued a regularization policy dated 01.10.2003 (Annexure P-3) for Group C and Group D employees working on daily wages/work-charge basis. The services of all the petitioners were ordered to be regularized by the respondents w.e.f. 20.06.2008 (Annexure P-5). The Chief Secretary, Haryana, issued a letter dated 05.03.2004 (Annexure P-7) clarifying that the regularization policy dated 01.10.2003 is applicable to the Boards/Corporations as well. Thereafter, the petitioners raised the claim that they are entitled to be regularized from the date of the policy i.e. 01.10.2003 instead of 20.06.2008. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners, in support of his arguments, relies upon the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaggo's case (supra)*** and submits that for pensionary benefits in terms of Rule 3.17, the past service rendered on daily wages/work-charge basis is required to be counted as laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in ***Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab, CWP No.2371 of 2010*** and ***State of Haryana and others v. Jai Bhagwan, LPA No.1892 of 2019***.

2.1. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice dated 11.02.2025 (Annexure P-13) submitted by the petitioners is decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.



3. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2, appearing on advance notice, submits that they have no objection, in case a direction is issued to the respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision of the legal notice dated 11.02.2025 (Annexure P-13) submitted by the petitioners by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the respondent No.2 is directed to consider the legal notice dated 11.02.2025 (Annexure P-13) filed by the petitioners and pass a speaking order in terms of the judgments passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo’s case (supra)*, *Vinod Kumar’s case (supra)*, *Shripal’s case (supra)* and *Dharam Singh’s case (supra)*, as well as the judgment rendered by this Court in *Poonam’s case (supra)*, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, 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 respondent No.2 as per the judgments rendered by this Court in *Harbans Lal’s case (supra)* and *Jai Bhagwan’s case (supra)*.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

17.04.2026

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No