



104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-19968-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 06.05.2026

Om Parkash and another

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. AG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-7021-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking issuance of directions to consider and regularize the services of the applicants-petitioners in view of the policy dated 16/18.06.2014 and the order dated 16.04.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024* titled as *Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants-petitioners submits that on 23.07.2019, the main petition was adjourned *sine die*, as the regularization



policy of 2014 was under consideration of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. 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 is taken up on board for final disposal today itself.

CWP-19968-2019

4. 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 petitioners on the post of Heavy Vehicle Drivers in terms of the policy dated 18.06.2014, 20.06.2014 & 14.08.2014 (Annexure P-2 colly.) with all the consequential benefits.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed as Heavy Vehicle Driver on contract basis in the years 2007/2008 with the respondent-Corporation and they are continuously working there without any break in service and have completed more than 23 years of service. Further, since the petitioners fulfill the requisite criteria, in view of ratio of law culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh***'s case (*supra*), they are entitled to regularization of their services.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the judgment dated 31.05.2018 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in ***CWP-17206-2014*** titled as ***Yogesh Tyagi and another Vs. State of Haryana and others***, has been set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan***



Singh's case (*supra*). At this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied in case their case for regularization is considered and decided by respondent No.3 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 them an opportunity of hearing.

7. Learned State counsel submits that case of the petitioners 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.3 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

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 16/18.06.2014 (Annexure P-2 colly.) has been upheld. The relevant portion of the 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.3-Commission, Municipal Corporation, Faridabad to examine the case of the petitioners 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 them 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 petitioners.

10. Needless to say, if case of the petitioners is considered favourably, they will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in **Yogesh Tyagi**’s case (*supra*).

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

[**HARPREET SINGH BRAR**]
JUDGE

06.05.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No