



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

103

CWP No.11934 of 2016(O&M)

Date of Decision: **02.07.2026**

Dr. Anita Rani

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Harish Nain, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J.**CM No.9606-CWP-2026**

Instant application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for listing the writ petition for an actual date of hearing and to decide the same.

Learned counsel for the applicant submits that vide order dated 27.09.2019 passed by this Court the present writ petition was ordered to be adjourned *sine die* to await the decision in SLP against the Division Bench judgment in ***CWP No.17206 of 2014 (Yogesh Tyagi and another v. State of Haryana and others)*** and now Hon'ble the Supreme Court has finally adjudicated the controversy vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure A1) rendered in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024 titled as Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** arising directly out of ***Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)***.



In view of the above, the application is allowed and with the consent of both the parties, the abovenoted writ petition is taken up on board for final decision for today itself.

CWP-11934 of 2016

1. Prayer in the present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing the decision of the respondents not to regularize the services of the petitioner with a further prayer to issue writ in the nature of *Mandamus* to consider the case of the petitioner for regularization in the light of policy dated 16.06.2014 (Annexure P9).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Lecturer on contract basis on 16.01.2008 in Management/Commerce subjects, thereafter, petitioner was relieved of her duties. However, the petitioner was again allowed to join in July, 2009 and she has been continuously working as Guest/Contract Lecturer since 12.08.2009. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner possesses the requisite qualifications and her claim for regularization should be considered in view of the government policy (Annexure P9). Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that she is performing her duties to the satisfaction of the superiors since the date of her appointment and there was no complaint, whatsoever, with regard to her work and conduct.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case, her case is considered and decided by the respondents in the light of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in



Madan Singh's case (supra), by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to them.

4. Learned State counsel submits that case of the petitioner would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** and appropriate order would be passed by the respondents in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026 and ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 has been upheld. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under: --

"25. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of the High Court dated 31.05.2018 stands partly modified as under:

(a) It is held that Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 are valid and the judgment of the High Court to the extent it holds otherwise is set aside. The intervenors who are similarly situated and entitled to the benefit of the Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 shall be entitled to the reliefs flowing from such declaration, subject to verification by the competent authority.

xxx

xxx

xxx

(c) The employees, who had approached the High Court and who were granted liberty to take steps after the present batch of appeals were decided, are free to take appropriate steps in accordance with this judgment."

6. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Director General, Higher Education Department to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** and pass a speaking order after affording her an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the

CWP-11934 of 2016(O&M)

2026:PHHC:089324



date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

7. Needless to say, if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, they will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in ***Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)***.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
'om'

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