



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

104

CWP No.9188 of 2018(O&M)

Date of Decision: **29.05.2026**

1. Baljeet SinghPetitioner
Versus
Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Ltd.Respondent

CWP No.11337 of 2020

2. Ramesh KumarPetitioner
Versus
Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Ltd.Respondent

CWP No.9207 of 2018

3. Ramesh KumarPetitioner
Versus
Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Ltd.Respondent

CWP No.11300 of 2020

4. Baljit SinghPetitioner
Versus
Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Ltd.Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Jai Bhagwan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for the respondent.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

CM No.8740-CWP-2026

The present application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for placing on record copy of judgment dated 16.04.2026 as Annexure A1 with exemption from filing certified copy thereof.



In view of the grounds mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Copy of judgment dated 16.04.2026 as Annexure A1 is ordered to be taken on record. Filing of certified copy thereof is exempted.

Registry is directed to place the same at an appropriate place.

CM-8741-CWP-2026 in CWP No.9188 of 2018

CM-8483-CWP-2026 in CWP No.11337 of 2020

CM-8720-CWP-2026 in CWP No.9207 of 2018

CM-8754-CWP-2026 in CWP No.11300 of 2020

The present application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for revival up the present petition and for deciding the same.

Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that vide order dated 17.12.2020 passed by this Court the present writ petitions were 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 decided a bunch of connected cases vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure A1) rendered in in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024 titled as Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** including ***Yogesh Tyagi case (supra)*** and, thus, prays for revival of the present writ petitions.

In view of the above, all these application are allowed and with the consent of both the parties, all the abovenoted writ petitions are taken up together on board for final decision for today itself.

Main Case

1. This order of mine shall dispose of the above-mentioned writ petitions as they arise from a similar factual matrix. However, for the sake of brevity, the facts are being extracted from CWP No.9188 of 2018.



2. Prayer in the present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari*, for quashing of impugned order dated 27.02.2018 (Annexure P1) whereby claim of the petitioner for regularization of his services with effect from 01.10.2003, at par with his junior, Shri Sanjay Kumar, Salesman, who was regularized vide order dated 07.07.2004, has been denied. The condition “with immediate effect” contained in order dated 09.09.2014 (Annexure P4) regularizing the services of the petitioner may also be quashed to the extent it denies regularization from 01.10.2003. A further prayer has been made for issuance of writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondent to modify order dated 09.09.2014 and to regularize the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 01.10.2003, i.e. the date from which his junior, namely, Sanjay Kumar was regularized alongwith all consequential benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed as Salesmen on daily wages against sanctioned vacant posts on 04.12.1993 and since then, they are continuously working in the office of the respondent. It is submitted that services of the petitioners were illegally terminated on 10.05.1996. They challenged the said order of the respondent, thereafter, they were reinstated with continuity of services and 50% back wages in view of award dated 26.09.2006 passed by the learned Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hisar. They petitioners are continuously working in the office of the respondent and there is no complaint against her. They have completed more than 32 years of services. As such, the petitioners fulfill the requisite criteria, as culled out by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Madan Singh’s case (supra)*.



6. 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 respondent 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.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents 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 respondent in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

8. 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.”

9. In view of the above, present writ petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondent-Managing Director, Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Ltd. to examine the case of the petitioners in terms of judgment



rendered by the Hon'ble 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.

10. 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)***.

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

12. Photocopy of the order be placed on the files of connected cases.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

'om'

Whether speaking/reasoned. :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable. :	Yes/No