

2026:PHHC:072849



119

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-14530-2026
DECIDED ON: 11.05.2026

TARSEM SINGH AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Aman Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner(s)

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been instituted invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners along with all consequential benefits on the post of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator manned by them, in light of policy decision/notification dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-5) issued by the State of Haryana as well as in view of judgment dated 16.04.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP No. 33265 of 2018 titled as "*State of Haryana vs. Yogesh Tyagi*."

2. The petitioners, namely Tarsem Singh, Virender Pal Singh, Devender Sharma and Amit Kumar, were appointed as Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operators in the Women and Child Development Department, Haryana, on contractual basis after undergoing a regular selection process pursuant to public advertisement and

have continued in service without any break since their initial appointments. The particulars of the petitioners are as under:

Name of Petitioner	Post	Date of Joining/Appointment
Tarsem Singh	Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator	15.12.2009
Virender Pal Singh	Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator	2009
Devender Sharma	Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator	2009
Amit Kumar	Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator	15.12.2009

3. The services of the petitioners have been extended from time to time and they claim to be working against sanctioned vacant posts. The petitioners seek regularization of their services under the Haryana Government policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-5), which provides for regularization of contractual employees having completed three years of service as on 28.05.2014. Though the said policy was earlier quashed by this Court vide judgment dated 31.05.2018 passed in CWP-31.05.2018. The Supreme Court, while dealing with an appeal against the same has now upheld the policy vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure P-6) passed in Civil Appeal No. 1996 of 2024 titled *Madan Singh and Others vs. State of Haryana and Others*.

4. The petitioners contend that despite fulfilling all eligibility conditions and despite the fact that similarly situated employees have been regularized, their claim has not been considered by the respondents, compelling them to file the present writ petition seeking directions for regularization with all consequential benefits.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Government of Haryana issued a policy/notification dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-5) for regularization of the services of Group C and Group D employees who had completed more than three years of continuous service as on 28.05.2014, subject to certain conditions, which are culled out hereunder:-

“(i) That the employee/worker should have worked for not less than 3(three) years as on 28th May, 2014 and still in service.

(ii) That the employee/worker possessed the prescribed qualifications for the post on the date of appointment / engagement.

(iii) The post against which the regularization is to be done should be a sanctioned vacant post at the time of initial appointment/engagement and also at the time of regularization.”

6. The specific case set up by the petitioners is that they have rendered service approximately 16 years from the date of his joining in the year 2009, when they were engaged on contractual basis after undergoing a regular selection process pursuant to public advertisement and have continued in service without any break since their initial appointments. Appointment letters to this effect were also issued by the Director, Women & Child Development Department Haryana.

7. Notice of motion.

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

9. Learned State counsel submits that a Division Bench of this Court in LPA No. 1810-2025 titled *Aas Mohammad and Ors. vs. State of Haryana & Ors.*, along with other connected appeals, vide order dated 23.04.2026, on the assurance given by the learned Advocate General, Haryana, disposed of the bunch of LPAs with a stipulation that the case of each and every individual in the said appeals would be considered afresh and fresh orders would be passed therein, in view of the principles laid down in Madan Singh's case (supra).

10. It is further submitted that, on the same terms, the case of the present petitioner can also be considered and, if he is found fully eligible and covered under the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-5), necessary orders regarding their regularization shall be passed.

11. In light of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case any further at this stage, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition with a direction to respondent No.2, Director, Women and Child Development Haryana or any other competent authority, to consider the case of each petitioner, in the light of the above observations and after considering the pleas raised in the petition, while treating the writ petition itself as a comprehensive representation made by the petitioners, pass the speaking order within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. A copy of the order so passed shall be conveyed to the petitioners within one week thereafter.

12. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

11.05.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No