

2026:PHHC:086046



CWP-17935-2026

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

141

CWP-17935-2026

Date of decision: **29.05.2026**

Kulwinder Singh

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. K.S. Benipal, Advocate for
Mr. Harnoor Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Sonak, AAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners in view of the judgment dated 03.09.2025 passed by this Court in ***CWP-12211-2021*** titled as ***Hans Raj and others vs. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation***, and to grant them all consequential benefits, including counting of past service, in terms of the judgments passed by this Court in ***Harbans Lal vs. State of Punjab***, ***CWP-***

2026:PHHC:086046



CWP-17935-2026

2371-2010, and *State of Haryana and others vs. Jai Bhagwan, LPA-1892-2019.*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially recruited through an outsourcing agency against permanent and continuous vacancies in the PEPSU Road Transport Corporation. It is submitted that pursuant to Punjab Government Notification No.55 of 2016 and Head Office letter No.12536 dated 29.12.2016, the petitioner was shifted from outsourced contractual employment to direct contractual employment under the Corporation on the post of Driver with effect from 29.12.2016. Counsel further submits that the services of the petitioner are governed by the PEPSU Road Transport Corporation (Conditions of Appointment and Service Regulations), 1981.

2.1. It is further contended that upon completion of 18 months of continuous service against a permanent post, the petitioner became entitled to regularization with effect from 04.11.2018. Learned counsel submits that this Court, vide common judgment dated 03.09.2025 passed in ***CWP-12211-2021*** titled as ***Hans Raj & Ors. v. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation***, directed regularization of identically situated employees within a period of six weeks, failing which they were to be deemed regularized.

2.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that despite the petitioner serving a legal notice dated 10.01.2026 seeking the same relief, no action has been taken by the respondents. It is argued that in compliance with



CWP-17935-2026

the judgment dated 03.09.2025, the petitioners in the said case have already been regularized; however, the present petitioner, despite being identically situated, has been denied the same benefit merely because he was not a party to the aforesaid writ petition. It is thus contended that the action of the respondents is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice dated 10.01.2026 (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner is decided by the respondent by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner in the light of judgment passed by this Court in *Hans Raj (supra)*.

4. Learned State counsel, appearing on advanced notice, submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to the respondent for time-bound consideration and decision of the legal notice dated 10.01.2026 (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to consider the legal notice dated 10.01.2026 (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner in the light of judgment rendered by this Court in *Hans Raj (supra)* and pass a speaking order, after affording him an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified

2026:PHHC:086046



CWP-17935-2026

copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondent.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

7. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

29.05.2026*parul verma*

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