

CWP-14862-2015

-1-

2026:PHHC:074137



102

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

**CWP-14862-2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.05.2026**

Gian Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. J.S. Maanipur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, Advocate,
Ms. Anshu Gupta, Advocate and
Ms. Ayushi, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-7715-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for disposal of the main petition in terms of the judgment dated 23.04.2026 passed by this Court in **CWP-26127-2017** titled as ***Sandeep Kumar Vs. State of Haryana anda others*** (Annexure A-1), which squarely



covers the controversy involved in this petition, as the regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-6) was held valid by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024, arising out of SLP-27349-2018*** titled as ***Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others***, decided on 16.04.2026.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner submits that the regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-6) was under consideration of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and now the controversy involved in the present petition has been settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)***.

3. In view of the above, this application is allowed and the main petition, which is on regular board of this Court at Sr. No.1449, is taken up on board for final disposal today itself.

CWP-14862-2015

4. Instant writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 30.06.2014 along with all the consequential benefits, in terms of the policy dated 30.03.2006 (Annexure P-1) or the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-6), as applicable to the respondent-UHBVNL and also in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Virender S. Hooda and others Vs. State of Haryana and another, 1999(4) RSJ 198***, the judgments passed



by the Division Bench of this Court in ***K.G. Nanchahal Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2002 (1) RSJ 765, Ranbir Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others, 2001 (4) RSJ 676*** and the judgment of this Court in ***Sohan Lal and others Vs. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and others, 2002 (3) RSJ 430.***

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner joined the respondent-Corporation as Driver on contract basis (DC rate) on 24.03.2002 and has been continuously working. He has completed more than 24 years of service. Further, the petitioner fulfills the requisite criteria, in view of ratio of law culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's*** case (*supra*), as such, he is entitled to regularization of his services.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case his case for regularization is considered and decided by respondent No.1 by treating the present petition as a comprehensive representation, in a time bound manner 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.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that case of the petitioner would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's*** case (*supra*) and appropriate order would be passed by respondent No.1 in a time bound manner after



affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

8. 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 has decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026, of which **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-6) has been upheld. The relevant portion of the aforesaid 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.”

9. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1-Managing Director, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) and



pass a speaking order after affording him an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

10. Needless to say, if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, he would be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in *CWP-17206-2014* titled as *Yogesh Tyagi and another Vs. State of Haryana and others*, decided by the Division Bench of this Court on 31.05.2018.

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

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

12.05.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No