



Date of decision:06.05.2026

CWP-14005-2026

....Petitioners

VERSUS

....Respondents

CWP-14008-2026

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

....Respondents

CWP-14040-2026

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

....Respondents

CWP-14061-2026

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

....Respondents

Present : Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

* * * *

2026:PHHC:070673

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)**

1. This common order shall dispose of all the aforementioned petitions. However, for the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from CWP-14005-2026.

2. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction, especially in the nature of *mandamus*, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners, who have been satisfactorily serving the respondent-Corporation on various posts for more than 8–10 years, in view of the judgment rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in *Jaggo v. Union of India & Ors. (AIR 2025 SC 296)* and by this Court in *Daljeet Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr., CWP No. 5684 of 2026 decided on 22.04.2026*, as also in light of the availability of regular sanctioned posts. It is further prayed that a writ in the nature of *mandamus* be issued directing the respondents to grant all consequential benefits to the petitioners, including regular pay scale along with arrears of pay and allowances, due increments, consideration of seniority and resultant promotions, from the date of their regularization.

2.1. It is also prayed that during the interregnum, till the petitioners are regularized, the respondents be directed to grant them equal pay scale along with other benefits, as are being granted to similarly situated

2026:PHHC:070673



employees working against regular posts, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of ***Punjab v. Jagjit Singh, (2017) 1 SCC 148.***

2.2. It is further prayed that the respondents be restrained from terminating the services of the petitioners or taking any arbitrary action against them during the pendency of the present writ petition, in the interest of justice.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed by the competent authority through outsourcing agency on various posts with the respondent-Corporation. The work and conduct of the petitioners have been appreciated all along and their term has been extended year by year from the last more than eight-ten years by the office of respondent-Corporation on contractual basis against the regular sanctioned posts. The petitioners have submitted various representations to the office of respondent-Corporation praying therein to regularize their services as also to grant all consequential benefits i.e. regular pay scale along with payment of arrears of pay and allowances, due increments, consideration of relative seniority and resultant promotion thereof, to the petitioners from the date of their regularization while following the ratio of the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Jaggo vs. UOI & Ors., Civil Appeal No.14831 of 2024, decided on 20.12.2024*** and by this Court in case titled as ***Hans Raj and others vs PEPSU Road Transport***

2026:PHHC:070673



Corporation, CWP No.12211 of 2021, decided on 03.09.2025, wherein similarly situated contractual employees appointed against sanctioned posts, after due process and having rendered long years of service, were held entitled to consideration for regularization and *State of Punjab and others vs Jagjit Singh and others, 2016 (4) SCT 641*, wherein it has been held that the temporary employees including contractual employees who are discharging the duties as being discharged by the regularly selected candidates are entitled for the minimum of the pay scale along with Dearness Allowance, however, till date, no action has been taken thereupon.

3.1. He further stated that similar situated employees have also approached this Court by filing *Daljeet Singh's case (supra)*, which was allowed and the judgment was rendered *in rem* yet, the respondent-Corporation are compelling each and every employee to approach this Court, which is against the public policy. He submitted that the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by judgment rendered by this Court in *Daljeet Singh's case (supra)*, for seeking relief in the same terms and the same has been allowed by this Court vide judgment dated 22.04.2026.

3.2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has limited his prayer to the extent that the present petition be treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided in a time bound manner by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of being heard.

4. Notice of motion.

2026.PHHC:070673



5. Mr. Amit Shukla, DAG, Punjab appears and waives service of notice on behalf of respondent No.1.

6. Mr. Abhilaksh Gaiind, Advocate, Standing Counsel with Mr. Rakesh Roy, Advocate and Ms. Priya Jarial, Advocate, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondent No.2-PRTC and submits that he has no objection in the event this Court issues a direction to Managing Director of respondent No.2-PRTC to consider and decide the petition of the petitioners empathetically in a time-bound manner, in the light of the judgments passed by the this Court in *Daljeet Singh's case (supra)*.

7. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, all the four petitions are disposed of and the respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to treat the writ petition as representation and consider the claim of the petitioners, by passing a speaking order in a time-bound manner, in the light of the judgment referred to hereinabove, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and in case, the petitioner's case is covered, the petitioners would be extended the same benefit as has been extended by this Court to the petitioner in *Daljeet Singh's case (supra)*. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioners.

2026.PHHC:070673



8. Needless to observe that, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same be granted to them forthwith by the respondent No.2/competent authority, in accordance with law.

9. In case, the Managing Director of respondent No.2 deviates from the directions issued by this Court either in *Daljeet Singh's case (supra)* or in this case the petitioners would be at liberty to file appropriate application under Article 215 of the Constitution of India to initiate contempt proceedings.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

11. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

06.05.2026.

Parul verma

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No