



121

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

CWP-21428-2026

Date of decision: 16.07.2026

Dr. Sameesh Khunger

....Petitioner

Versus

Chaudhary Devi Lal University and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Parmender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Kumar Singla, Advocate
for the respondents.

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* directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner as an Assistant Professor (contractual) (Business Administration) on regular basis w.e.f. 23.03.2010 in the Department of Business Administration with all consequential benefits along with interest @ 12% per annum. Further, directing the respondents to decide the representations dated 08.01.2025 and 18.06.2026 (Annexures P-5 & P-6, respectively).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was appointed as Assistant Professor on contract basis on 23.03.2010 in subject of Business Administration and since then, he is continuously serving the respondent-University without any break for the last more than 16 years as discernible from Annexure P-2. Learned counsel further submits that the



CWP-21428-2026

-2-

petitioner possesses the requisite qualifications and his claim for regularization should be considered in view of the government policy (Annexure P-7). Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he is performing his duties to the satisfaction of the superiors since the date of his appointment and there was no complaint, whatsoever, with regard to his work and conduct.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case, his case is considered and decided by respondents No.1 & 2 in the light of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Civil Appeal No.1996 of 2024*** titled as ***Madan Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 16.04.2026 (Annexure P-9), by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to him.

4. Learned State counsel submits that case of the petitioner would be examined in the light of aforesaid judgment passed in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** and appropriate order would be passed by respondents No.1 & 2 in a time bound manner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

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



CWP-21428-2026

-3-

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 respondents No.1 & 2 to examine the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment rendered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Madan Singh's case (supra)*** and pass a speaking order after affording him 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 petitioner.

7. Needless to say, if case of the petitioner is considered favourably, he will be entitled to the same relief as has been extended to the petitioners in ***CWP No.17206 of 2014*** titled as ***Yogesh Tyagi and another v. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 31.05.2018.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

16.07.2026

Neha

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