

2026:PHHC:085267



153

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

**CWP-17693-2026
DECIDED ON: 29.05.2026**

VIPAN KUMAR AND ANR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Abhinav Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s)

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been instituted invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners in view of the Government instructions dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3), along with all consequential.

2. The petitioners were appointed as SDCs on daily wage basis against regular sanctioned posts on 31.01.2012 and 04.07.2012 respectively in the Panchayati Raj Department and, after change in nomenclature during the year 2015-16, have been working as Accounts Clerks under Outsourcing Policy Part-II. It is averred that the petitioners have rendered continuous and unblemished service for more than 14 years and, despite being eligible under Government instructions dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3) providing for regularization of Group 'C' and 'D' employees and despite regularization of similarly situated and senior

employees, their services have not been regularized. It is further pleaded that the petitioners served a legal notice dated 27.03.2026 (Annexure P-7) seeking regularization, but no decision has been taken thereon. Hence, the present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners with consequential benefits in accordance with the applicable Government policies and judicial precedents and to decide their pending legal notice.

3. The petitioners seek regularization of their services under the Haryana Government policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3), which provides for regularization of contractual employees having completed three years of service as on 28.05.2014. Though the said policy was earlier quashed by this Court vide judgment dated 31.05.2018 but the Supreme Court, while dealing with an appeal against the same has now upheld the policy vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure P-5) passed in Civil Appeal No. 1996 of 2024 titled *Madan Singh and Others vs. State of Haryana and Others*.

4. The petitioners contend that despite fulfilling all eligibility conditions and despite the fact that similarly situated employees have been regularized, their claim has not been considered by the respondents, compelling them to file the present writ petition seeking directions for regularization with all consequential benefits.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Government of Haryana issued a policy/notification dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-3) for regularization of the services of Group C and Group D employees who had completed more than three years of continuous service as on 28.05.2014, subject to certain conditions, which are culled out hereunder:-

“(i) That the employee/worker should have worked for not less than 3(three) years as on 28th May May,2014and still in service.

(ii) That the employee/worker possessed the prescribed qualifications for the post on the date of appointment / engagement.

(iii) The post against which the regularization is be done should be a sanctioned vacant post at the time of initial appointment/engagement and also at the time of regularization.”

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners were appointed against regular sanctioned posts and have been continuously discharging their duties since the year 2012 without any break in service. It is argued that despite completion of more than 14 years of service and despite fulfillment of the conditions contained in the Government policy dated 18.06.2014, whereby employees completing three years of continuous service are entitled to regularization, the respondents have failed to regularize their services, whereas similarly situated employees senior to the petitioners have already been regularized.

7. It is, thus, prayed that the respondents be directed to regularize the services of the petitioners from the date they became eligible along with all consequential benefits.

8. Notice of motion.

9. Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, learned DAG, Haryana, having been served with an advance copy of the petition, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State.

10. 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).

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

12. In light of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case any further at this stage, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition with a direction to respondent No.1-Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Government of Haryana, or any other competent authority, to consider and decide the legal notice dated 27.03.2026 (Annexure P-7), examine the claim of the petitioners for regularization, and adjudicate the same in the light of the principles laid down in Madan Singh's case (supra), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and by passing a speaking order within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. A copy of the speaking order so passed shall be supplied to the petitioners within one week thereafter.

12. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

29.05.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No