



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

101

CWP No.373 of 2016(O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.07.2026

Dr. Krishan Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Chaudhary Devi Lal University and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Parmender Singh, Advocate
for petitioners No.1, 3 and 4.

Mr. Manish Kumar Singla, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Mr. Sajjan Singh Malik, Advocate and
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
for the respondent.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)**CM No.10978-CWP-2026**

The present application has been filed under Section 151 of CPC for revival up the present petition and for deciding the same.

Learned counsel for applicants submits that vide order dated 15.02.2023 passed by this Court the present writ petition was ordered to be adjourned *sine die* to await the decision in SLP against the Division Bench judgment in ***CWP No.17206 of 2014 (Yogesh Tyagi and another v. State of Haryana and others)*** and now Hon'ble the Supreme Court has decided a bunch of connected cases vide judgment dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure A2) rendered in in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024 titled as Madan Singh and others Vs. State of***



Haryana and others including ***Yogesh Tyagi case (supra)*** and, thus, prays for revival of the present writ petition.

In view of the above, instant application is allowed and with the consent of both the parties, the abovenoted writ petition is taken up together on board for final decision for today itself.

Main Case

1. Prayer in the present 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 impugned communication dated 17.04.2015 (Annexure P11) issued by respondent No.2 declining regularization of the services of applicants/petitioners with further prayer to issue a writ in the nature of *Mandamus* directing the respondents to regularise the services of applicants/petitioners on the post of Assistant Professors in terms of the policy dated 16.06.2014 (Annexure P10).

2. Learned counsel for petitioners, at the outset, submits that the present writ petition was dismissed by co-ordinate Bench vide order dated 13.08.2018, however, the said order was recalled on application submitted on behalf of petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 and the writ petition was accordingly ordered to be restored at its original number qua petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 only. Learned counsel further, *inter alia*, contends that petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 were appointed as Assistant Professors with the respondent-University on contract basis as Guest Faculty against sanctioned posts on the recommendations made by the Selection Committee as provided under the rules of the University. The said petitioners are continuously working in the office of the respondent and there is no complaint against them and they have completed more than 15 years of services. As such,



the said petitioners fulfill the requisite criteria, as culled out by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)***.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 submits that the said petitioners would be satisfied in case their case is considered and decided by the respondents in the light of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)***, by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to them.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that case of the petitioners would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** and appropriate order would be passed by the respondents in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided a bunch of cases on 16.04.2026 and ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** is the lead case, wherein regularization policy dated 18.06.2014 has been upheld. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under: --

“25. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of the High Court dated 31.05.2018 stands partly modified as under:

(a) It is held that Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 are valid and the judgment of the High Court to the extent it holds otherwise is set aside. The intervenors who are similarly situated and entitled to the benefit of the Notifications dated 16.06.2014 and 18.06.2014 shall be entitled to the reliefs flowing from such declaration, subject to verification by the competent authority.

xxx

xxx

xxx

(c) The employees, who had approached the High Court and who were granted liberty to take steps after the present batch of appeals were decided, are free to take appropriate steps in accordance with this judgment.”



6. In view of the above, present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Registrar, Chaudhary Devi Lal University to examine the case of petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 in terms of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Madan Singh's case (supra)* and pass a speaking order after affording them an opportunity of hearing, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken shall be conveyed to the said petitioners.

7. Needless to say, if case of petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 are considered favourably, they will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in *Yogesh Tyagi's case (supra)*.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

15.07.2026

'om'

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