



2026:PHHC:076268



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

126

CWP-15040-2026

Date of Decision: **14.05.2026**

Balwan Singh

....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Ms. Sonia G Singh Samber, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG Haryana.

Ms. Mansi Majoka, Advocate for Mr. Sukhdeep S Parmar,
Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)**

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to regularize the service of petitioner in view of the settled principal of law as settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Jaggo Versus Union of India and others*** the judgments of this Court in the case of '***Ishwar Versus State of Haryana*** and '***Hari Ram and others Versus State of Haryana***', considering the 24 years of service of petitioner in the interest of justice.



2026:PHHC:076268



2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was initially appointed as Security Guard on 05.05.1990 on daily wage basis and since then has been continuously discharging duties to the satisfaction of the respondents. It is submitted that the petitioner has been performing perennial and regular nature of duties identical to those being discharged by regular employees, however, despite extraction of continuous service for more than 24 years, the claim of the petitioner for regularization has not been considered by the respondents. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner also served legal notice dated 19.05.2015 (Annexure P-6), but no effective action has been taken thereupon.

2.1 It is further contended that similarly situated employees have already approached this Court by filing CWP-25042-2025 and CWP-31304-2025, wherein directions were issued for regularization of the petitioners therein. Learned counsel submits that the case of the present petitioner is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgments, as the petitioner has also rendered long and uninterrupted service extending over more than 24 years.

2.2 Learned counsel further argues that keeping an employee on temporary/daily wage basis for decades together, despite extracting regular and perennial work from him, is contrary to the settled principles of service jurisprudence and is antithetical to the concept of a welfare State. It is submitted that the action of the respondents in denying regularization to the petitioner by raising hyper-technical objections, after having continuously



CWP-15040-2026

2026:PHHC:076268

2026:PHHC:076268



availed his services for such a long period, is wholly arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

2.3 Learned counsel further submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the judgments rendered by this Court in ***CWP-25042-2025, Hari Ram and others Versus State of Haryana and others***, decided on 08.09.2025 (Annexure P-10) and ***CWP-31304-2025 and connected cases, Joginder Versus State of Haryana and others***, decided on 31.12.2025 (Annexure P-11). At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition may be treated as a comprehensive representation and a direction be issued to respondent No.2/competent authority to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner by passing a reasoned and speaking order, within a stipulated period, in the light of the aforesaid judgments, after affording an adequate opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, in accordance with law.

3. On advance notice, Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, whereas Ms. Mansi Majoka, Advocate for Mr. Sukhdeep S. Parmar, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3. They submit that they have no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2/competent authority to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner by passing a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law.



2026:PHHC:076268



4. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2/competent authority to treat the present writ petition as a comprehensive representation and to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner by passing a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, keeping in view the judgments rendered by this Court in *Hari Ram (supra)* and *Joginder (supra)*, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

4.1 It is further directed that the decision so taken shall be communicated to the petitioner forthwith. Needless to observe that in case the petitioner is found entitled to the relief claimed, all consequential benefits shall also be granted expeditiously, in accordance with law.

5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

Puneet Chawla

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