



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

Sr. No.208

Date of Decision: 22.05.2026

1) CWP-25771-2014

Anil Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

AND

2) CWP-10416-2015

Bahadur Singh and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

AND

3) CWP-10417-2015

Parveen Kumar and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

AND

4) CWP-10418-2015

Radha Chaudhary and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

AND



5) CWP-10419-2015

Nirmal Singh and others Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

AND

6) CWP-10420-2015

Kavita Malik and others Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

AND

7) CWP-13698-2015

Suryakant and another Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

AND

8) CWP-13268-2015

Monika Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

AND

9) CWP-14737-2016

Rakesh Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. R. K. Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Samrat Malik, Advocate,
Mr. Anshul Labana, Advocate,
Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate,
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Sajjan Singh Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amit Sahni, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
assisted by Mr. Harmanjit Singh Johal, Advocate.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

These petitions have been filed seeking regularisation of the petitioners in service, on the posts of Assistant Professor/Lecturer in the Department.

2. Learned senior counsel contended that in terms of the latest decision of the Supreme Court, dated 16.04.2026, rendered in *Madan Singh and others v. State of Haryana and others*, 2026 INSC 379, the petitioners are entitled to regularisation under the Government notification dated 16.06.2014, Annexure P-7. At this stage, they will be satisfied in case they are permitted to make an appropriate representation in each of the cases before the respondents raising the said grievance, which may be ordered to be decided within a specified period. All relevant particulars of the petitioners' services which entitle them to the claimed benefit will be mentioned therein.

3. Learned State counsel submits that in case such representation(s) are filed by the petitioners within four weeks from today, the same will be decided by respondent no.1 – Director General, Higher Education, by passing a speaking order thereupon in accordance with law in the light of *Madan Singh* case *ibid.*, within six months of receiving the representation(s).



4. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioners have no objection to the petitions being disposed of in terms thereof.

5. Ordered accordingly.

6. In case the order is not passed within the stipulated period, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioner(s) in each of the cases.

7. A photocopy of this order be placed on the case file(s) of connected matter(s).

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

22.05.2026

Mehak

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