

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

Date of decision: 29.05.2026

....Petitioners

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 5.

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 respondent to consider the petitioners for regular/permanent employment in accordance with the applicable policy of the Haryana Government. Further, directing respondent No.2 to take appropriate decision on the representations dated 12.04.2026 and 21.04.2026 (Annexures P-4 & P-5).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that petitioner No.1 was appointed on 15.06.2011 as part time Gardener and he continued with the respondents till date. Petitioner No.2 was engaged as part time Sweeper on 20.06.2011 and he is also serving the respondents without any adverse remarks. The petitioners are required to be regularized in terms of the regularization policy issued from time to time. He further submits that the



claim of the petitioners is required to be examined in light of the regularization policy dated 18.06.2014. The petitioners are fully eligible and till date, they have rendered 17 years of continuous service, however, they have not been granted the benefit of regularization. The petitioners have submitted detailed representations dated 12.04.2026 and 21.04.2026 (Annexures P-4 & P-5) which remained unheeded.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further relies upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 16.04.2026 in Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024 titled as ***Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** and submits that he would be satisfied if the representations (Annexures P-4 & P-5) of the petitioners is decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.2 to 5 submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision of the representations of the petitioners by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of and respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representations (Annexures P-4 & P-5) of the petitioners 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 petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.2.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

29.05.2026
Neha

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