



2026:PHHC:062733



2026:PHHC:062733

108

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

CWP-12435-2026

Date of decision: 24.04.2026

Suraj Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gurmail Singh Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.3 & 4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus/certiorari* for quashing of the impugned order dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure P-5). Further, for directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to re-join his service till the age of his retirement i.e. 58 years.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was appointed as a Safai Karamchari for one year in the year 2013 and his appointment was renewed annually based on good performance as discernible from Annexures P-1 & P-2. A show cause notice was issued by respondent No.4 on 24.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) alleging rude and indecent behaviour, gross negligence, indiscipline and disregard for the order of the higher officials. The petitioner filed a detailed reply on 25.02.2026 (Annexure P-4) stating the allegations were false and that he always followed orders.



CWP-12435-2026

-2-

Learned counsel for the petitioner emphasized that the termination order is in violation of the principles of natural justice as no inquiry was conducted and no opportunity of hearing was provided. As such, the impugned order is illegal and arbitrary and violates the petitioner's right to equality and fair procedure under Articles 14 & 21 of the Constitution of India.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondents No.3 & 4 submits that the petitioner is a contractual employee and he has been issued a show cause notice, to which he has responded. After considering his reply, the impugned order was passed. He relies upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***U.P. State Road Transport Corporation and others vs. Brijesh Kumar and another, 2024 AIR SC 4424*** and submits that, at the most, a contractual employee is entitled to a show cause notice before passing of any adverse order. The requirement of law, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Brijesh Kumar's case (supra)***, has been duly complied with, as such, the present petition is liable to be dismissed

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the petitioner was initially appointed in the year 2013 on a contractual basis and his engagement was reviewed annually. A show cause notice was issued by respondent No.4 on 24.02.2026 and the petitioner filed a reply on 25.02.2026 as discernible from Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively. As such, the respondents have complied with the ratio of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Brijesh Kumar's case (supra)***. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any violation of a statutory mandate. In such circumstances, this Court finds no ground to interfere.



2026:PHHC:062733



2026:PHHC:062733

CWP-12435-2026

-3-

5. In view of the discussion above, this Court finds no merit in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner. Consequently, the present petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby dismissed

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

24.04.2026

Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No