



222

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

LPA-3090-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14th January 2026

PANJAB UNIVERSITY THROUGH ITS REGISTRARAppellant(s)

V/s.

PARVEEN BALARespondent(s)

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA**
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present: Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate for the appellant.

 Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate for the respondent.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This Appeal is directed against judgement dated 11.09.2025 of the learned Single Bench passed in *CWP-6212-2020* and one another connected case, whereby a direction has been issued to regularize the services of the respondent within a period of six months from the date of passing of the order, if not regularized earlier.

2. It is not in dispute that the respondent was appointed in Panjab University as a Counter Clerk in 1990-1991. She continued to work till 2002 and was terminated on 30.09.2002. The termination was challenged before the Labour Court which answered the reference by holding the termination to be bad in law vide award dated 07.01.2010. The direction was issued to reinstate the respondent along with 40% backwages. The said award of the Labour Court has attained finality. Pursuant to it, the respondent has been working ever since. It in this context that the learned Single Judge has taken note of the Policy of the appellant/State to consider regularization on 10 years working and thereby accepted the claim of the respondent. For such purposes, learned Single Bench has placed reliance

upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jaggo Vs. Union of India and Others; 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826 and Dharam Singh and others Vs. State of U.P. and another; 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant argues that there is no Regularization Policy as on date under which the respondent could be considered.

4. It is undisputed that the Policy for regularization did exist in respect of those who have completed 10 years of service whereby in each year working was required to be above 240 days.

5. From the facts placed on record, it is apparent that the respondent was working from 1990 and under the award of the Labour Court, she has continued after the termination was set aside in 2002. The working of respondent was, therefore, more than three decades. We, therefore, cannot accept the appellant's contention that the claim of respondent was not covered under the existing Regularization Policy.

6. In view of the aforesaid, we find no substance in this appeal which consequently is dismissed with costs assessed at ₹10,000/- to be deposited in the Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh.

7. Pending application(s), if any, in this case, are disposed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

January 14, 2026.

Ess Kay

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