



103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-26127-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.04.2026

Sandeep Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. G.S. Gopera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-6190-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short 'CPC') for placing on record the judgment dated 16.04.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024, arising out of SLP No.27349 of 2018* titled as *Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others* as Annexure A-1 and also seeking exemption from filing certified copy thereof.



2. In view of the averments made in the application, same is allowed and copy of the judgment dated 16.04.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024*** titled as ***Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** is taken on record as Annexure A-1. Exemption sought is granted.

CM-6191-CWP-2026

3. This application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for fixing the main petition for motion hearing and for disposal of the same in terms of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's*** case (*supra*).

4. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner submits that the main petition was adjourned *sine die* vide order dated 16.11.2017 on the ground that the issue involved in the present petition is pending consideration before the Division Bench of this Court in ***CWP-17206-2014*** titled as ***Yogesh Tyagi and another Vs. State of Haryana and others***, which was disposed of vide judgment dated 31.05.2018, against which SLP No.27349 of 2018 was preferred by the employees before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, on 12.02.2019, following order was passed: -

“Adjourned sine die to await the decision of the SLP No.27349 of 2018 arising out of Yogesh Tyagi Vs. State of Haryan; 2018 (3) SCT 181.”

5. It is further submitted that judgment in the aforesaid SLP has



been pronounced by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 16.04.2026, as discernible from Annexure A-1. As such, the instant petition may be disposed of in terms of judgment in **Madan Singh**'s case (*supra*).

6. In view of the above, this application is allowed and the main petition is taken up on board for final disposal today itself.

CWP-26127-2017

7. 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 *certiorari* seeking quashing of the letter dated 29.04.2017/05.05.2017 (Annexure P-14), vide which claim of the petitioner for regularization was rejected and further to issue a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize his services with all the consequential benefits in view of the policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-9) and clarifications/instructions dated 28.07.2014 (Annexure P-10) issued by the Government of Haryana.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Computer Operator on 23.10.2007 on contract basis against a regular sanctioned post of Clerk by duly constituted Selection Committee and he is continuously serving respondent No.3 for the last more than 18 years. As such, the petitioner fulfills the requisite criteria laid down by the Selection Committee, as culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh**'s case (*supra*).

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the



petitioner would be satisfied in case his case is considered and decided by respondent No.2 by treating the present petition as a comprehensive representation, in a time bound manner in the light of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*), by passing a speaking order after affording him an opportunity of hearing.

10. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that case of the petitioner would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) and appropriate order would be passed by respondent No.3 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

11. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026 and **Madan Singh's** case (*supra*) is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P-9) has been upheld. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under: -

“25. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of the High Court dated 31.05.2018 stands partly modified as under:

(a) It is held that Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 are valid and the judgment of the High Court to the extent it holds otherwise is set aside. The intervenors who are similarly situated and entitled to the benefit of the Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 shall be entitled to the reliefs flowing from such declaration, subject



to verification by the competent authority.

xxx

xxx

xxx

(c) The employees, who had approached the High Court and who were granted liberty to take steps after the present batch of appeals were decided, are free to take appropriate steps in accordance with this judgment.”

12. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Madan Singh**’s case (*supra*) and pass a speaking order after affording him an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the petitioners.

13. Needless to say, if the petitioner satisfies the requisite criteria, he would be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to his other counterparts, who were petitioners in **Yogesh Tyagi**’s case (*supra*).

14. The pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

[**HARPREET SINGH BRAR**]
JUDGE

23.04.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No