



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-14620-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.05.2026

Chotu Ram

....Petitioner

Versus

The Haryana State Cooperative Agriculture and Rural Development and
others

....Respondents


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Prashant Kumar Kapila, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

Prayer in this 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 impugned order dated 15.05.2023 (Annexure P-3) whereby the claim of the petitioner for regularization has been rejected. Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner in view of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.14831 of 2024, titled as ***Jaggo vs Union of India***, decided on 20.12.2024 (Annexure P-4) placing its reliance upon the judgment titled as ***Secretary State of Karnataka and others vs Uma Devi*** and also granting him all consequential benefits i.e. seniority, pay fixation and arrears of salary and Civil Writ Petition No. 31304 of 2025 titled as ***Joginder vs State of Haryana and others*** on 31.12.2025



(Annexure P-6) where non-regularization of the services of an employee who had completed 10 years of service has been considered as arbitrary and illegal.

Mr. Prashant Kumar Kapila, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondents and file Memo of Appearance, which is taken on record. The Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

Learned counsel for the respondents, at the outset, submits that the petitioner has already approached this Court by filing CWP-18136-2023, titled as *Chhotu Ram vs Haryana State Agriculture and Rural Development Bank Limited and others*, seeking the same relief of regularization and therefore, the present second writ petition seeking the identical relief is not maintainable.

In response thereto, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he was not aware of the pendency of earlier writ petition and as such, seeks permission to withdraw the present petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

12.05.2026

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No