



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-15387-2026
DECIDED ON:18.05.2026

RICHU DAUGHTER OF SHRI AMAR NATH
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

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

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ, or Direction especially in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner as Junior Programmer -cum-Clerk in terms of the Policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-2), on the basis of his appointment on as Data Entry Operator on contract basis on 01.08.2005 in terms of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case of *"Jaggo Versus Union of India reported as 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826*, and also in case of *"Union of India Versus K. Velajagan and others" reported as 2025 SCC OnLine SC 837*, and law laid down by this Hon'ble Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 31304 of 2025 *"Joginder Versus State of Haryana and others"* decided on 31.12.2025 as he was appointed after taking interview, written test, but several similarly situated

employees have been regularized namely; Ashsish Sharma and others, whereas his services were not regularized on account of the decision given by the Division Bench of this Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 17206 of 2014 ***"Yogesh Tyagi and another Versus State of Haryana and others"*** which was disposed of vide judgment dated 31.05.2018 against which SLP No.27349 of 2018 was preferred reported as 2018(3) SCT 181, which has now been decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India along with Civil Appeal No. 1996 of 2024 arising out of SLP No. 27349 of 2018 titled as ***"Madan Singh and others Versus State of Haryana and others"*** decided on 16.04.2026 and regularize his services as Data Entry Operator-cum-Clerk with all consequential benefits in terms of the Policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-2), as he fulfills all the requisite conditions

The petitioner, after acquiring the requisite qualifications, was initially appointed as Data Entry Operator through HARTRON in the office of respondent No.3 on 25.03.2002 and thereafter, on qualifying the HARTRON test for the post of Junior Programmer, was deployed and joined as Junior Programmer on 01.08.2005. She continued to serve uninterruptedly, including a temporary transfer to the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ambala from 16.12.2008 to 15.02.2009, and has been discharging her duties satisfactorily without any break in service. The State of Haryana framed Regularization Policies dated 18.06.2014 and 20.06.2014 (Annexures P-2 & P-3 respectively) for ad hoc/contractual employees, under which the petitioner claims eligibility, having completed the requisite service and possessing the prescribed qualifications against a sanctioned vacant post.

The petitioner claims to be covered under the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-2) as well as by the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in

Civil Appeal No. 1996 of 2024 titled *Madan Singh and Others vs. State of Haryana and Others*, along with a bunch of connected appeals.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. AG. Haryana, having served with an advance copy of the petition, has put in appearance and he has no objection to the aforesaid proposal put forth by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Accordingly, Respondent No. 2, i.e. Chief Electoral Officer, Haryana, is directed to decide the representation dated 31.12.2024 and examine the claim for regularization of the petitioner and adjudicate the same in light of the principles laid down in *Madan Singh’s case* (supra), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and by passing a speaking order. A copy of the speaking order so passed shall be supplied to the petitioner within one week thereafter.

It is further clarified that all the pleas raised in the present petition and the grounds taken therein shall be duly considered at the time of adjudication of the petitioner’s case before passing the speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing.

The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

18.05.2026
Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No
Whether reportable :Yes/No