

2026.PHHC:078768



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision:19.05.2026

1) 121 CWP-15700-2026

Gagandeep Singh Brar and others
....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab And Another
....Respondents

2) 122 CWP-15703-2026

Jasmal Singh And Others
.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab And Another
....Respondents

3) 123 CWP-15706-2026

Kulwant Singh And Others
.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab And Another
....Respondents

4) 124 CWP-15708-2026

Gurjeet Singh And Others
.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab And Another
....Respondents

2026:PHHC:078768



5) 125

CWP-15711-2026

Kuldeep Singh And Others

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab And Another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rakesh Roy, Advocate for
Mr. Abhilaksh Gaind, Advocate, Standing Counsel for PRTC
with Ms. Priya Jarial, Advocate
for respondent No.2 in CWP-15711-2026
(through video conferencing).

Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.2
in CWP-15700-2026 and CWP-15706-2026.

Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.2
in CWP-15703-2026.

Mr. Hardeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2
in CWP-15708-2026.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. With the consent of all the parties, the aforementioned writ petitions are taken up together and are being decided by this common judgment. However, for the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from **CWP-15700-2026**.

2026:PHHC:078768



2. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly in the nature of *mandamus*, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners, who have been serving the respondent-Corporation on various posts for the last about 08–10 years to the satisfaction of the authorities, in view of the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo v. Union of India & Others* as well as by this Court in *Daljeet Singh & Others v. State of Punjab & Another*, and also keeping in view the availability of regular sanctioned posts.

2.1. The petitioners have further prayed for issuance of directions to the respondents to grant all consequential service benefits, including regular pay scales, arrears of pay and allowances, annual increments, consideration of seniority and consequential promotions, from the date their services are regularized. A further prayer has also been made for issuance of directions to the respondents to grant equal pay scales and other attendant benefits to the petitioners, at par with similarly situated regular employees working against sanctioned posts, till the regularization of their services, in light of the principles laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *State of Punjab v. Jagjit Singh*.

2.2. The petitioners have also sought a direction restraining the respondents from terminating their services or taking any coercive or

2026:PHHC:078768



arbitrary action against them during the pendency of the present writ petition, in the interest of justice.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed by competent authority through outsourcing agency on various posts with respondent-Corporation on 29.04.2015. Their term has been extended year by year for more than 08-10 years against regular sanctioned posts and they perform similar nature of work in terms of quality, quantity and responsibility as regular employees in defined pay scale. Petitioners submitted various representations for regularization and consequential benefits, relying on *Jaggo v. Union of India & Others, Civil Appeal No.14831 of 2024* and *Hans Raj vs. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation, CWP No.12211 of 2021*. Legal notice dated 24.04.2026, Annexure P-1, was served upon respondent-Corporation but no action taken. Similarly situated employees filed *CWP Nos.5684/2026, 5766/2026 and 8371/2026*, which were allowed on 22.04.2026.

3.1. He further stated that similar situated employees have also approached this Court by filing *Daljeet Singh (supra)*, which was allowed and the judgment was rendered *in rem* yet, the respondent-Corporation are compelling each and every employee to approach this Court, which is against the public policy. He submitted that the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by judgment rendered by this Court in *Daljeet Singh*

2026.PHHC:078768



(*supra*), for seeking relief in the same terms and the same has been allowed by this Court vide judgment dated 22.04.2026.

3.2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice dated 24.04.2026, Annexure P-1, of the petitioners is decided by the respondents by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Roy, Advocate for Mr. Abhilaksh Gaind, Standing Counsel for PRTC, along with Ms. Priya Jarial, Advocate, appeared through video conferencing and waived service of notice on behalf of respondent No.2 in **CWP-15711-2026**. Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate, waived service on behalf of respondent No.2 in **CWP-15700-2026** and **CWP-15706-2026**; Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate, in **CWP-15703-2026**; and Mr. Hardeep Singh, Advocate, in **CWP-15708-2026**. They submitted that they have no objection in the event this Court issues a direction to Managing Director of respondent No.2 to consider and decide the petition of the petitioners empathetically in a time-bound manner, in the light of the judgments passed by the this Court in **Daljeet Singh (supra)**.

6. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, all the five

2026.PHHC:078768



petitions are disposed of and the respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to decide the legal notice dated 24.04.2026, Annexure P-1, and consider the claim of the petitioners, by passing a speaking order in a time-bound manner, in the light of the judgment referred to here-in-above, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and in case, the petitioner's case is covered, the petitioners would be extended the same benefit as has been extended by this Court to the petitioner in *Daljeet Singh (supra)*. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioners.

7. Needless to observe that, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same be granted to them forthwith by the respondent No.2/competent authority, in accordance with law.

8. In case, the Managing Director of respondent No.2 deviates from the directions issued by this Court either in *Daljeet Singh (supra)* or in this case the petitioners would be at liberty to file appropriate application under Article 215 of the Constitution of India to initiate contempt proceedings.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

CWP-15700-2026, CWP-15703-2026, CWP-15706-2026, CWP-15708-2026 and CWP-15711-2026

2026.PHHC:078768



10. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

19.05.2026

Parul verma

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No