



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.106

CM-7656-CWP-2026 in/and
CWP-9634-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Birma Devi

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Dharamveer Phour, Advocate, for the applicant – petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

CM-7656-CWP-2026

The application has been filed seeking revival of the petition, which was disposed of vide order dated 10.08.2023, with the following observations:

3. Learned State counsel submits that both these policies along with other regularisation policies issued by the State Government stand quashed by a Division Bench of this Court, vide judgment dated 31.05.2018 passed in CWP No.17206 of 2014 titled *Yogesh Tyagi and another v. State of Haryana and others*, against which Special Leave to Appeal (c) No.4531 of 2023 is pending before the Supreme Court. Therefore, the petitioner's claim for regularisation cannot be considered.

4. The facts submitted by learned State counsel are not disputed. In these circumstances, all the petition(s) are disposed of being not maintainable, with liberty to the petitioner(s) to get their petition(s) revived by moving appropriate application(s) in



case any right survives in them to seek regularisation after final decision by the Supreme Court in the matter.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the *Yogesh Tyagi* case and connected matters have now been decided by the Supreme Court vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 rendered in *Madan Singh and others v. State of Haryana and others*, 2026 INSC 379, which entitles the petitioner to seek regularisation in terms therewith under the Government notifications dated 01.10.2003 and 18.06.2014, Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively.

3. In view thereof, the application is allowed. The main petition is revived to its original number and status, and taken on Board today itself.

CWP-9634-2017

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking regularisation of the petitioner in service, who is working as Coolie in the respondent Department.

2. Learned counsel contended that in terms of the latest decision of the Supreme Court in *Madan Singh* case *ibid.*, the petitioner is entitled to regularisation under the Government notifications dated 01.10.2003 and 18.06.2014. At this stage, she will be satisfied in case she is permitted to make an appropriate representation before the respondents raising the said grievance, which may be ordered to be decided within a specified period. All relevant particulars of the petitioner's service which entitle her to the claimed benefit will be mentioned therein.

3. Learned State counsel submits that in case any such representation is filed by the petitioner within four weeks from today, the same will be decided by respondent no.2 – Engineer in Chief (PWD B&R), Chandigarh, by passing a speaking order thereupon in accordance with law in the light of *Madan Singh* case *ibid.*, within six months of receiving the



- 4. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.
- 5. Ordered accordingly.
- 6. In case the order is not passed within the stipulated period, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioner.
- 7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
Maninder

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