

CWP-18936-2017

-1-

2026:PHHC:076020



104

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

**CWP-18936-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.05.2026**

Mukesh Kumari

... Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Raman B. Garg, Advocate and
Mr. Mayank Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-7927-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for actual date of hearing and disposal of the main petition in terms of the judgment rendered 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*.

2. In view of the averments made in the application, same is allowed and the main petition, which was adjourned *sine die* vide order dated



16.11.2023, is taken up on board for final disposal today itself.

CWP-18936-2017

3. Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 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 in terms of the regularization policy dated 28.07.2014 (Annexure P-6) on the post of Data Entry Operator.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was deployed in the respondent-Nigam as Data Entry Operator on job work basis through Hartron on 01.09.2009 against the vacant post of Lower Division Clerk. Thereafter, she was directly engaged w.e.f. 23.12.2011, as discernible from Service Contract Agreement (Annexure P-3) and since then, she has been continuously working in the respondent-Nigam without any break. She has completed more than 16 years of service. Further, the Government of Haryana framed a regularization policy on 18.06.2014 to regularize the services of Group 'C' & 'D' employees on contract basis, in which vide notification dated 28.07.2014 (Annexure P-6), certain clarifications were made. It is further contended that since 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*), she is entitled to regularization of her services.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case her 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.

6. 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.

7. 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, clarified vide notification dated 28.07.2014 (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.”

8. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1-Managing Director, Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited, to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of the judgment rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh***’s case (*supra*) and pass a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to her, 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.

9. Needless to say, if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, she 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.

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

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

14.05.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No