

CWP-17577-2026

2026.PHHC.084458



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

CWP-17577-2026

Date of decision: 27.05.2026

Mahavir Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vikas Kuthiala, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly in the nature of *mandamus*, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners from the date they completed 10 years of service, in terms of the orders/judgments dated 31.12.2025, 19.01.2026, 05.03.2026 and 23.03.2026 passed by this Court as well as order dated 13.02.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, being similarly situated and squarely covered by the said judgments/orders; further

CWP-17577-2026

2026.PHHC.084458



directing the respondents to grant all consequential benefits along with arrears of pay and interest thereupon.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioners, being fully eligible and qualified, were appointed as Assistant Line Men (ALM) by the respondent–Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam on 15.09.2006 in District Jind against duly sanctioned regular posts on DC Rates in terms of the Policy Instructions dated 16.02.2009 (Annexure P-1). It is submitted that the petitioners have been continuously discharging their duties for the last about 20 years and their services have been extended from time to time without break.

2.1. It is further contended that the respondent-State had regularized the services of a large number of Group ‘C’ and Group ‘D’ employees, who had completed 10 years of service, in terms of instructions dated 07.07.2014. Although the issue relating to the said policy is pending consideration before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, this Court, in a number of cases, has granted relief of regularization to similarly situated employees. In this regard, reliance has been placed upon the judgments passed by this Court in ***CWP No. 31304 of 2025*** titled as ***Joginder Vs. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 31.12.2025 (Annexure P-2), ***CWP No. 13015 of 2021*** titled as ***Manak Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 19.01.2026 (Annexure P-3), ***CWP No. 6481 of 2026*** titled as ***Shiv Kumar and others Vs. State of***

CWP-17577-2026

2026.PHHC.084458



Haryana and others decided on 05.03.2026 (Annexure P-4) and ***CWP No. 8790 of 2026*** titled as ***Pradeep Kumar Ranga and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 23.03.2026 (Annexure P-6). Reliance has also been placed upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***SLP (Civil) No. 29214 of 2019 (2026 INSC 156)*** titled as ***Pawan Kumar and others Vs. Union of India*** and others decided on 13.02.2026 (Annexure P-5).

2.2. It is, thus, argued that since the petitioners are identically situated to the employees who have already been granted the benefit of regularization, denial of similar relief to the petitioners would amount to hostile discrimination and would violate Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has limited his prayer to the extent that the present petition be treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided in a time bound manner by passing a speaking order after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana puts in appearance and accept notice on behalf of for respondent-State. Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate put in appearance and accept on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition would be considered by passing a speaking order in accordance with the law by

CWP-17577-2026

2026.PHHC.084458



respondent(s)/competent authority.

7. Therefore, in view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of and the respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the claim of the petitioners in light of the precedent of similarly situated employees as rendered in the judgments Annexures P-2 to P-6 (supra) and pass a speaking order after affording them an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioners. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondents.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.05.2026

parul verma

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