



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

115

CWP-11820-2026

Date of decision: 21.04.2026

Harjeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Raywant Kaushish, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 16.09.2025 (Annexure P-7), whereby the representation dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-6) submitted by the petitioner for regularization of his services as Shift Attendant has been rejected. Further prayer has been made for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant the benefit of regularization of services to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially engaged with the respondent/Department and thereafter, continued to serve as Shift Attendant on contractual basis till his retirement on 31.12.2024. After rendering long years of service, the



petitioner submitted a representation dated 02.09.2025 seeking regularization of his services in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo vs. Union of India and others, 2025 AIR SC 296*, and also the judgment rendered by this Court in CWP-17190-2000, titled as *Karam Chand and others vs Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and others*, decided on 03.04.2025, however, the same has been illegally rejected vide impugned order dated 16.09.2025 (Annexure P-7). He further submits that the action of the respondents is arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner stood retired on 31.12.2024. He further submits that the petitioner had not sought regularization during his service tenure and has approached this Court after an inordinate delay of about 09 months from the date of retirement. Once the petitioner has retired, the relationship of employer and employee has come to an end and no right survives for seeking regularization. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the respondents relies upon the judgment rendered by this Court in CWP-19168-2025 titled as *Joginder Singh vs. HVPNL and another* decided on 11.07.2025.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance.



5. The issue involved in the present writ petition is no longer *res integra* and stands settled by this Court in ***Joginder Singh's case (supra)***. The operative part of the said judgment, reads as under:

“2. The petitioner(s) through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to regularize him as Shift Attendant in view of State Government Policies and judgment of Supreme Court in the case of ‘Jaggo Vs. Union of India and Others’, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826.

3. On the asking of Court, Mr. Ravi Sharma, Advocate conceded that no petition seeking regularization was filed during service tenure, however, he submits that Supreme Court vide judgment dated 20.12.2024 has granted benefits to many persons, thus, petitioner should be retrospectively regularized.

4. The petitioner was appointed on contract basis. He has no absolute or fundamental right to claim regularization. He as per his convenience remained dormant during his service. He did not think it appropriate to seek regularization. He has filed instant petition after his retirement. The relation between petitioner and employer has snapped. There seems no reason to invoke writ jurisdiction at this belated stage.”

6. In the present case also, admittedly, the petitioner was engaged on contractual basis and did not seek regularization during his service tenure. The petitioner has approached this Court after his retirement. Once the petitioner has retired, the relationship of employer and employee stands snapped. The claim raised at such a belated stage does not warrant interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction.



7. In view of the law laid down in the aforesaid judgment and the facts of the present case, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition. Consequently, the writ petition is dismissed.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

21.04.2026
yakub

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