



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

112

CWP-20622-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.07.2026

Rajmal and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. N.S. Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the Conditions No.2, 5 and 24 of the letter dated 12.01.2022 (Annexure P-11) issued by the respondents. Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners from the date their case was approved by the Board of Governors (BOG) of Mewat Model Schools Society in its meeting dated 22.02.2017 (Annexure P-2) against the sanctioned vacant posts, at par with the similar candidates along with all consequential benefits, including seniority, back-wages, and pay-fixation.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioners were appointed on various non-teaching posts, including



Clerk, Peon, Sweeper, Mali and Library Attendant, in the Mewat Model Schools Society on contractual basis during the years 2003, 2005, 2008, 2010, 2011 and 2012, against sanctioned posts and they have been rendering continuous service with unblemished records for more than 10 to 15 years. The State Government/respondent-Society framed comprehensive regularization policies for teaching and non-teaching staff in the years 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2017, pursuant to which the Governing Body of the respondent-Society, in its meeting held on 16.02.2017, resolved to regularize the services of all the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that, although the respondent-Society issued regularization orders dated 22.03.2017 in favour of 2-3 candidates from the approved list, the petitioners were denied similar benefit without any justification. He further submits that the draft regularization orders in respect of the petitioners had also been prepared and approved by the Chairman and Vice Chairman but the same were never signed or issued by the competent authority. Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that perennial work is being extracted from the petitioners at par with their regular counterparts. The the claim of the petitioners is further supported by the judgment passed by this Court in **CWP No.15778 of 2015** filed by similarly situated employee Mahesh Kumar, which was allowed vide order dated 18.07.2018 and the LPA-1704-2018 preferred by the respondent-Society against the said judgment was dismissed on 30.10.2018. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the claim of the



petitioners is also covered by the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh and others vs State of Haryana and others, 2026 SCC Online (SC) 628*** (Annexure P-18) and ***Jaggo vs Union of India and others, 2024 SCC Online (SC) 3826***, the judgments passed by this Court in CWP-13015-2021 and connected cases, titled as ***Manak Singh and others vs State of Punjab and others***, decided on 19.01.2026 (Annexure P-19), CWP-4436-2026, titled as ***Poonam and another vs State of Haryana and others***, decided on 13.02.2026 (Annexure P-20), CWP-6174-2026, titled as ***Manoj Kadian and others vs State of Haryana and others***, decided on 27.02.2026 (Annexure P-21), and CWP-31304-2025 and connected cases, titled as ***Joginder vs State of Haryana and others***, decided on 31.12.2025 (Annexure P-22).

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would be satisfied if the instant writ petition of the petitioners is treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision thereof by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, the respondent No.2 is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the case of the petitioners and pass a speaking order in the light of the judgments



referred hereinabove (Annexures P-18 to P-23, respectively), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioners. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.2.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

10.07.2026
yakub

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