



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

CWP No.16779 of 2026

Date of decision: 26.05.2026

Ashok Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present :- Mr.K.S. Banyana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J.(Oral)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226 of the Constitution India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus with a direction to the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner in view of Regularization Policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3) along-with all consequential benefits.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed as a part-time sweeper on 05.10.2001. It is also submitted that subsequently the services of the petitioner were terminated and vide award dated 19.04.2012, he was reinstated with continuity of service and 50% back wages.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner's case is covered under the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure

P-3) 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.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel submits that a Division Bench of this Court in LPA No. 1810-2025 titled *Aas Mohammad and Ors. vs. State of Haryana & Ors.*, along-with other connected appeals, vide order dated 23.04.2026, on the assurance given by the learned Advocate General, Haryana, disposed of the bunch of LPAs with a stipulation that the case of each and every individual in the said appeals would be considered afresh and fresh orders would be passed therein, in view of the principles laid down in *Madan Singh's case (supra)*.

6. It is further submitted that, on the same terms, the case of the present petitioner can also be considered and, if he is found fully eligible and covered under the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3), necessary orders regarding their regularization shall be passed.

7. Accordingly, Respondents-Competent Authority, is directed to 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 within a period of eight weeks from receipt of certified copy of this order. A copy of the speaking order so passed shall be supplied to the petitioner within one week thereafter.

8. 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 petitioners' case before passing the speaking order.

9. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

26.05.2026
seema

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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