



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

133

CWP-11781-2026

Date of decision: 20.04.2026

Rajinder Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ankush Rampal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Sonak, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Priyanka Dhillon, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

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 mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioner. Further, for issuance of directions to the respondents to decide the representations dated 27.03.2026 and 30.03.2026 (Annexure P-3 and P-4, respectively).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially appointed by respondent No.2 on contractual basis on the post of Junior Draftsman. Since the date of her initial appointment, the contractual engagement of the petitioner has been extended continuously without any break. The perennial work is extracted from the petitioner at par with her regular counterparts. The



petitioner is neither engaged as a part time worker nor as a casual labourer. There has been no complaint against the petitioner for the past 11 years. The petitioner's continuous engagement on contract basis is violative of the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaggo vs. Union of India and others, 2025 AIR SC 296*** as well as the judgment of this Court passed in **CWP No.35744 of 2025** titled as ***Anoop Singh vs. State of Punjab and others***, decided on **23.12.2025**.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he would be satisfied if the representations dated 27.03.2026 and 30.03.2026 (Annexure P-3 and P-4, respectively) filed by the petitioner is decided by the respondent(s)/competent authority by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 submits that she has no objection in case a direction is issued to the respondent(s)/competent authority for time-bound consideration and decision of the representations of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent(s)/competent authority is directed to consider the representations dated 27.03.2026 and 30.03.2026 (Annexure P-3 and P-4, respectively) filed by the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording her 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 petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondent(s)/competent authority.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

20.04.2026
yakub

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