



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

102

CWP No.6165 of 2016(O&M)

Date of Decision: **02.07.2026**

Sohan Pati and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Nishant Maini, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioners.

Mr. Harish Nain, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J.**CM No.9442-CWP-2026**

Instant application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for revival of the writ petition and to decide the same.

Learned counsel for the applicants submits that vide order dated 30.07.2019 passed by this Court the present writ petition was ordered to be adjourned *sine die* to await the decision in SLP against the Division Bench judgment in ***CWP No.17206 of 2014 (Yogesh Tyagi and another v. State of Haryana and others)*** and now Hon'ble the Supreme Court has finally adjudicated the controversy vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure A1) rendered in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024 titled as Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** arising directly out of ***Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)***.

In view of the above, the application is allowed and with the consent of both the parties, the abovenoted writ petition is taken up on board for final decision for today itself.

**CWP-6165 of 2016**

1. Prayer in the present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of *Mandamus*, directing the respondents to absorb the petitioners on regular basis in view of the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in SLP No.9230-9231 of 2009 titled as State of Haryana v. Ashok Kuma and others and also in view of the policy of the Government dated 18.06.2014 (Annexure P8) as they possess the required qualifications prescribed under the rules.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were engaged as Instructors/Lecturers in the panel of Guest Faculties on 11.02.2009 after following due process of selection, however, they were relieved of their duties on completion of semester. Thereafter, they were again selected to the said posts pursuant to advertisement dated 02.08.2009 issued by the respondents and they joined accordingly on 18.08.2009. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that they were performing their duties to the satisfaction of their superiors since the date of their appointment and there was no complaint, whatsoever, with regard to their work and conduct.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that at this stage, the petitioners would be satisfied in case their case is considered and decided by the respondents 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 an opportunity of hearing to them.
4. Learned State counsel submits that case of the petitioners would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in ***Madan Singh's case***



(supra) and appropriate order would be passed by the respondents in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

5. 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 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."

6. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Director, Department of Technical Education to examine the case of the petitioners in terms of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Madan Singh's case (supra)** and pass a speaking order after affording them 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.

7. Needless to say, if case of the petitioners are considered favourably, they will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in **Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)**.



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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

02.07.2026

'om'

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No

Whether Reportable. : Yes/No