

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

**117 + 125 (I) CWP-35811-2025
Date of Decision : January 19, 2026**

MOTI LAL

-PETITIONER

V/S

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AND ANOTHER

-RESPONDENTS

(II) CWP-37935-2025

ANIL KUMAR

-PETITIONER

V/S

THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AND ANOTHER

-RESPONDENTS

(III) CWP-38011-2025

AMIT KUMAR

-PETITIONER

V/S

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AND ANOTHER

-RESPONDENTS

(IV) CWP-38288-2025

VICKY

-PETITIONER

V/S

THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AND ANOTHER

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Harmeet Kaur Chanan, Advocate, and
 Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

 Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate, and
 Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate, and
 Ms. Sheena Dahiya, Advocate
 for the respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. All these writ petitions are amenable for being decided through a common verdict on account of their clothing a common issue appertaining to regularization.

2. The petitioners' claim for regularization was rejected by the competent authority on multiple grounds, the principal ground being that the petitioners had been relieved from service on 30.06.2022, i.e. prior to submission of their claim for regularization.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that subsequent to the passing of the impugned orders, there has been a material change in circumstances owing to the framing of a regularization policy dated 25.12.2025 by the Punjab and Haryana High Court. It is, therefore, contended that, at this stage, the petitioners restrict their prayer to the issuance of a direction to the District and Sessions Judge concerned to reconsider their claim for regularization in the light of the policy (*supra*).

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.2 submits that the petitioners do not fall within the ambit of the policy (*supra*), as they have not completed the requisite ten years of service. It is further submitted that the petitioners were relieved from service as far back as the year 2022 and, therefore, no question of regularization of their services arises.

5. This Court specifically queried learned counsel for the respondent No.2 as to whether the case of the petitioners had been examined by the competent authority in the light of the policy (*supra*), to which he fairly concedes that no such exercise has been undertaken, as the impugned

orders were passed prior to the framing of the regularization policy by the Punjab and Haryana High Court.

6. Be that as it may, at this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the petitioners' claim, a direction is issued to the competent authority to reconsider the petitioners' claim for regularization in accordance with the regularization policy (*supra*). The said exercise shall be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

7. All these writ petitions stand **disposed of** accordingly.

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on file of each connected case.

January 19, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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