



108

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-12219-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.04.2026

Lalita Sangar

... Petitioner

Vs.

Punjab Health System Corporation and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Bikramjit S. Patwalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepanshu Mehta, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Amit Shukla, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. 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 services of the petitioner w.e.f. 2011 in terms of the judgment dated 12.02.2026 rendered by this Court in **CWP-24673-2025** titled as ***Bhupesh Kumar and others Vs. Punjab Health System Corporation and another*** (Annexure P-14), vide which services of identically placed employees have been ordered to be regularized and the judgment dated 19.12.2018 passed in **CWP-11427-2015** titled as ***Sukhjad***



Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others (Annexure P-7), wherein the policy instructions dated 18.03.2011 (Annexure P-4) have been interpreted for the purposed of regularization of services of contract employees within the State of Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Medical Laboratory Technician in the year 2001/2002 by the respondent-Corporation after following a proper selection process, as discernible from advertisement and appointment letter (Annexures P-2 & P-3 respectively). Further, on 18.03.2011, the Government of Punjab issued a regularization policy (Annexure P-4), which was extended to the employees of the Boards/Corporation vide letter dated 17.11.2011 (Annexure P-5) for regularizing the services of contractual employees, who have completed 03 years of continuous service. It is further contended that the petitioner completed more than 10 years of service in the year 2011, which is evident from the office order dated 23.12.2011 (Annexure P-6). The aforesaid policy (Annexure P-4) was interpreted by this Court in ***Sukhjad Singh***'s case (*supra*) and the petitioners therein were granted the benefit of regularization, by holding that the contractual employees appointed against sanctioned posts are entitled to regularization. The said judgment was upheld in ***LPA-516-2020*** titled as ***State of Punjab and others Vs. Sukhjad Singh and others***, decided on 28.03.2022 (Annexure P-8) and even the ***Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.15325 of 2022*** titled as ***The State of Punjab and another Vs. Sukhjad Singh and others***, was dismissed on 02.05.2025 (Annexure P-9).



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further refers to the judgment passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Jyoti Rana and others Vs. State of Punjab and others, CWP-290-2023***, which was decided on 24.09.2024 along with one another CWP-23027-2016 (Annexure P-10) in terms of ***Sukhjad Singh's*** case (*supra*), while rejecting the objection regarding engagement of the petitioners therein through outsourcing agency. Further, perusal of the letter dated 16.12.2021 (Annexure P-12) and official noting (Annexure P-13) clearly indicates that the petitioner was appointed against a sanctioned post and more than 300 regular posts of Medical Laboratory Technician are still lying vacant. It is submitted that similarly situated Medical Laboratory Technicians filed CWP-24673-2025, which was allowed vide judgment dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-14) directing regularization of their services. Further, the petitioner submitted a detailed representation on 23.03.2026 (Annexure P-15), which remains unheeded. The respondents have regularized the services of other employees i.e. Computer Operators and Staff Nurses, but the same benefit has not been granted to the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner is batch mate of the petitioners in ***Bhupesh Kumar's*** case (*supra*) and selected in the same selection process along with them.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that hostile discrimination by the respondents towards the petitioner and their action violates the policy (Annexure P-4) and binding judgments in ***Sukhjad Singh's*** case (*supra*), ***Jyoti Rana's*** case (*supra*) and ***Bhupesh Kumar's*** case (*supra*).



Further, regularizing one set of contractual employees and denial of same benefit to the petitioner violates Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.1-Corporation submits that he is not in a position to controvert the fact that the petitioner is batch-mate of the petitioners in **Bhupesh Kumar's** case (*supra*) and was selected pursuant to the same selection process. However, he submits that upon verification, if case of the petitioner is found identical to those petitioners in **Bhupesh Kumar's** case (*supra*), same benefit will be granted to her and if not so, right of respondent No.1-Corporation may be reserved for passing an appropriate order.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file with their able assistance.

7. The issue regarding regularization of services involved in the present petition has already been dealt with in a catena of judgments by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court. However, as the petitioner claims that services of her similarly situated employees/batchmates, who are petitioners in **Bhupesh Kumar's** case (*supra*) and selected in the same selection process, have already been regularized, she would also be entitled to the same relief.

8. In view of the above, present petition is allowed. The respondents are directed to regularize the services of the petitioner in terms of the judgment rendered by this Court in **Bhupesh Kumar's** case (*supra*).

9. It is clarified that after verification, if the petitioner is found



batch-mate and identically circumstanced to the petitioners in ***Bhupesh Kumar***'s case (*supra*), then same relief be granted to her and if her case is not found identical to those petitioners, respondent No.1-Corporation shall reserve its right to pass an appropriate order.

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

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

23.04.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No