



\$~27 to 30

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 13172/2022 & CM APPL. 39889/2022

**GHOORE LAL AND ORS**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Romy Chacko & Mr. Sachin  
Singh Dalal, Advs.

versus

**GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS**

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, GNCTD  
with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.  
Aliza Alam & Mr. Mohnish  
Sehrawat, Advs. for R-1.

Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC for IHBAS  
with Mr. Abhinav Jha, Adv. for R-  
2&3.

28

+ W.P.(C) 13175/2022 & CM APPL. 39892/2022

**SONALI SHERRING AND ORS**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Romy Chacko & Mr. Sachin  
Singh Dalal, Advs.

versus

**GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS**

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, GNCTD  
with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.  
Aliza Alam & Mr. Mohnish  
Sehrawat, Advs. for R-1.

Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC for IHBAS  
with Mr. Abhinav Jha, Adv. for R-  
2&3.



29

+

W.P.(C) 13429/2022 & CM APPL. 40778/2022

SONIA MASIH AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Romy Chacko & Mr. Sachin  
Singh Dalal, Advs.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, GNCTD  
with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.  
Aliza Alam & Mr. Mohnish  
Sehrawat, Advs. for R-1.  
Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC for IHBAS  
with Mr. Abhinav Jha, Adv. for R-  
2&3.

30

+

W.P.(C) 1228/2024 & CM APPL. 5188/2024

VINEET KUMAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pankaj Kaushik & Mr. Narender  
Kaushik, Advs.

versus

GOVT, OF NCT OF DELHI AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, SC, GNCTD  
with Mr. Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms.  
Aliza Alam & Mr. Mohnish  
Sehrawat, Advs. for R-1.  
Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC for IHBAS  
with Mr. Abhinav Jha, Adv. for R-  
2&3.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**



## **ORDER**

**01.12.2025**

%

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners rely upon the decision of Division Bench of this Court in *Pawan Sharma and Others v. Government of NCT of Delhi and Others* in W.P.(C) 2117/2025 decided on 10.11.2025 to contend that the petitioners fulfilled the propositions set out in the Division Bench judgment considering the decision of the Supreme Court in *Vinod Kumar v. Union of India*; (2024) 9 SCC 327, *Jaggo v. Union of India*; 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826, *Shripal v. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad*; 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221 and *Dharam Singh v. State of U.P.*; 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735 i.e.,

(i) If

(a) the employees are selected by a process which mirrors regular recruitment, by holding selections and interviews,

(b) they have worked continuously for several years, and

(c) they are performing duties essential for the establishment or organization, they are entitled to regularization.

(ii) The right to regularization, thus earned, is substantive in nature.

(iii) In such cases, the initial label under which they were recruited, whether part-time, or contractual, or casual, or ad hoc, or temporary, would not matter.

(iv) However, the appointment must not be illegal, mala fide, surreptitious, or “back door”.

(v) In such circumstances, it is not open to the respondents to contend that the posts occupied by the employees were not regular posts. The recurrent nature of the duties performed by the employees necessitated the



classification of the posts as regular, irrespective the original label under which the employees may have been appointed. The initial temporary, ad hoc, contractual, or casual, nature of their employment stood transformed, in such cases, “into a scenario demanding fair regularization”.

(vi) The right to regularization would enure, in such cases, even if the posts against which the employees were appointed were not sanctioned posts - though, in the present case, the posts against which the petitioners were appointed were sanctioned.

2. Learned counsel for respondent nos.2 and 3 seeks time to have instructions.
3. Put up on 07.01.2026.

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J**

**DECEMBER 1, 2025**  
*'ha'*