



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
119

CWP-12943-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.04.2026

Subhash Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Himanshu Munjal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 10.

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 petitioner on the post of Assistant Lineman (ALM), in view of the regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-5) and also in view of the ratio of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Madan Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others, 2026 INSC 379, Jaggo vs. Union of India, 2024 INSC 1034 and Shripal vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad, 2025 SCC Online SC 221 and* the judgments rendered by this Court in CWP-6174-2026, titled as *Manoj Kadian and others vs. State of Haryana and others*, and CWP-4436-2026, titled as



Poonam and another vs. State of Haryana and others and also grant all the consequential benefits including counting of past service and other benefits to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner fulfills the primary condition of regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-5) issued by the Government of Haryana, by having completed more than three years of continuous service against a sanctioned post as on the cut-off date. He further submits that the petitioner has rendered satisfactory and unblemished service while discharging his duties. He further contends that the perennial work is being extracted from the petitioner at par with his regular counterparts. The petitioner is neither engaged as a part-time worker nor as a casual labourer. There has been no complaint or adverse remarks against the petitioner. The petitioner's continuous engagement on contract basis is violative of the ratio of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)***, ***Jaggo's case (supra)***, ***Shripal's case (supra)***, ***Manak Singh's case (supra)***, which recognizes the right of long-serving contractual employees to be considered for regularization, however, the respondents have failed to take any decision in this regard. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the case of the petitioner is identical to the judgments rendered by this Court in ***Manoj Kadian's case (supra)*** and ***Poonam and another vs State of Haryana and others (CWP-4436-2026)***, whereby services of the petitioners have been regularized in



terms of the directions issued by this Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner lastly submits that the petitioner submitted a detailed representation dated 08.04.2026 (Annexure P-7) seeking regularization of the services, which is still pending consideration and has not been decided by the respondents.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the representation dated 08.04.2026 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner 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 respondents No.2 to 10, appearing on advance notice, submits that they have no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation dated 08.04.2026 (Annexure P-7) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation dated 08.04.2026 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner and pass a speaking order in terms of the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Madan Singh's case (supra)*, *Jaggo's case (supra)*, *Shripal's case (supra)*, *Manak Singh's case (supra)* as well as the judgments passed by this Court in *Manoj Kadian's case (supra)* and *Poonam's case (supra)*, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, 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 to him forthwith by respondent No.2 as per the judgments rendered by 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*.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
yakub

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