



114

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

**CWP-14481-2026
DECIDED ON: 11.05.2026**

KULDEEP KUMAR**.....PETITIONER(S)****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****.....RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL****Present: Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate for the petitioner(s)****SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 26/227 of Constitution of India praying for issuance a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing impugned action of the respondents vide which the petitioner is not allowed to join on the post of Data Entry Operator/computer operator in the office of the respondents. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus for direction to the respondents to open the portal and allow to the petitioner to work continue on the post of Data Entry Operator/computer operator on the place of previous post in view of letters dated 18.12.2025 (Annexure P-40), letter dated 20.2.2026 (Annexure P-41) and letter dated 12.3.2026 (Annexure P-42) in the interest of justice.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the recommendation dated 12.03.2026 (Annexure P-42), whereby renewal of the contract for the financial year 2026–27 of employees working in the Headquarters and District Offices under Haryana Kaushal Rozgar Nigam was sought.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contends that the case of the petitioner is also on identical lines as in CWP-11629-2026 titled *Rajesh Kumar vs. State of Haryana & Ors.*, wherein this Court had issued notice of motion for 27.05.2026.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG, Haryana, having been served with an advance copy of the petition, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. This Court is of the considered opinion that, at this stage, when no order has been passed by respondent No.2, i.e. the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Haryana, on the recommendation relied upon by the petitioner as recorded in the earlier part of this order, the authorities should take an appropriate decision on the said recommendation. In this regard, learned State counsel assures the Court that a necessary decision shall be taken on the petitioner's recommendation within a period of six weeks from the receipt of a certified copy of this order.

7. In light of the above assurance made by learned State counsel, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not wish to press the instant petition at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the same is disposed of, expecting from respondent No.2, namely the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Haryana, shall take a final decision expeditiously within the stipulated period as directed by this Court.

9. Ordered accordingly.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.05.2026

Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No