



112

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

**CM-752-LPA-2026 & CM-800-LPA-2026
in/and LPA-3102-2025**

Date of Decision: 5th February 2026

PANJAB UNIVERSITY THROUGH ITS REGISTRAR AND OTHERS

.....Appellant(s)

V/s

ANIL KUMAR AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

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

Present Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Jagdeep Jaswal, Advocate,
for respondents No. 2, 4 to 6, 8 to 10, 12, 15, 18 to 20, 23 to
25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37, 40 to 49, 52, 54, 56 to 57
(31 respondents in No.)

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

CM-752-LPA-2026

This application is filed by the respondents seeking pre-ponement of date of hearing in the main Appeal from 07.05.2026 to an early date.

For the reasons assigned in the application, the same is allowed and the main Appeal along with its CM applications are taken on board today itself for hearing with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

LPA-3102-2025 (O&M)

1. Heard learned counsel for appellant and learned counsel for the 31 respondents, who are still in employment with the appellant-University.

2. Learned Single Judge, vide order dated 11.09.2025, has disposed of the Writ Petition filed in the 2015 by the respondents with a

direction to accord consideration to respondents' claim for regularization, keeping in view 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. A further direction was issued that unless the respondents were regularized, they shall be deemed to have been regularized upon expiry of six weeks from the date of the said order.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that individual facts of each case will have to be examined, and the claim of regularization can be considered only in terms of the regularization policy itself. It is further stated that the directions issued by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the cases of *Jaggo (Supra)* and *Dharam Singh (Supra)*, shall be taken into consideration.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents states that the respondents have been working with the appellant-University since several years i.e. 2008 onwards and therefore, their claims for regularization will have to be dealt with as per regularization policy.

5. The Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Uma Devi ; (2006) 4 SCC 1 has clearly held that the claim for regularization can be accorded consideration in terms of the regularization policy. The subsequent judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in *Jaggo (Supra)* and *Dharam Singh (Supra)*, further clarify the position in law, as per which all those who are working for substantially long period, are required to be considered for regularization in terms of the observations made by the Court. However, while doing so, the individual

facts of each case will have to be considered. No blanket direction can be issued to the effect that upon expiry of six weeks’ period all the respondents stand regularized. The only direction which ought to have been issued was to accord consideration to the claim of respondents for regularization, keeping in view the regularization policy applicable in the appellant-University as also the observations made by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo (Supra)* and *Dharam Singh (Supra)*.

6. In that view of the matter, we modify the judgment dated 11.09.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge and **dispose of** this Appeal with a direction upon the appellant-University to examine the claim of all respondents, independently, considering the length of their service in accordance with the applicable regularization policy, keeping in view the observations made by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo (Supra)* and *Dharam Singh (Supra)* within a period of three months from today.

7. The respondents, who are still in employment, shall not be disengaged till an appropriate decision in terms of the above observations is taken and communicated to them.

8. All pending applications in this case, if any, are disposed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

February 5, 2026
Ess Kay

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