

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

Date of decision: 29.05.2026

....Petitioner

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil 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 consider the claim of the petitioner for job security by treating the 7 days' time as a deemed service which occurred due to outbreak pandemic COVID-19. Further, directing the respondents to treat the service of the petitioner continue in view of the Section 25B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and also to allow the petitioner to continue till decide the claim/adjudicate the petition or grant job security.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was appointed as Conductor on contractual basis on 02.07.2019 and worked from 02.07.2019 to 31.01.2021. On 16.11.2022, the deployment letter was issued to the petitioner by the HKRNL. On 06.12.2024, the Government of Haryana implemented the Haryana Contractual Employees (security of Service) Act, 2024. The petitioner submitted requisite particulars for job security on online portal, however, the petitioner falls short of mandatory 240



days of service in a contractual service year by a mere margin of seven days which has taken place due to lockdown imposed by the Government during the onslaught of COVID-19 pandemic. As such, the petitioner has not wilfully abstained from work rather, it was due to the COVID-19 lockdowns. The petitioner has submitted a representation (Annexure P-11) which remained unheeded.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, he would be satisfied if the representation (Annexure P-11) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana and Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and respondents No.4 & 5, respectively and submit that they have no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.5 for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

6. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.5 is directed to consider the representation (Annexure P-11) of the petitioner 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 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 respondent No.5.



CWP-18386-2026

-3-

7. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

Neha

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