



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

**CWP-28728-2019 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision : 05-05-2025**

**BIKRAM SINGH**

**.....Petitioner**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS**

**.....Respondent(s)**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. J.P.S Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, DAG Punjab.

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)**

1. In the present petition, the petitioner who is working through the Contractor is claiming regularisation of his services under the Punjab Adhoc, Contractual, Daily Wage and Work Charged and Outsourced Employees Welfare Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred as "2016 Act").

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner was working on the contract basis through the outsourcing agency but as he was working with the principal-Department, which belongs to the Government of Haryana, he is entitled for regularisation of his services under the 2016 Act.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that firstly, 2016 Act has already been superseded and is no longer existing and further, any employee who was working through the outsourcing agency, is not entitled for regularisation of his services keeping in view the judgment of this Court while passing order in CWP No.1046 of 2025 titled "***Nishan Singh Vs. State of Haryana and ors.***" and other connected cases decided on 04.04.2025 wherein,

it has been held that the contractual employees working through the outsourcing agency are not entitled for regularisation of their services.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the present case with their able assistance.

5. Once, it is a conceded fact that the petitioner was working with the outsourcing agency, there was no master and servant between the petitioner and the respondent. The petitioner cannot be treated as an employee of the respondent-State so as to grant him the benefit of 2016 Act so as to regularise his services.

6. Further, the said question of law has already been considered by this Court in *Nishan Singh's case (supra)* wherein, it has been held that the employees working under the outsourcing agency, are not entitled for the benefit of regularisation policy.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to rebut the said settled principle of law.

8. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances especially when there is no master and servant relationship between the petitioner and the respondent-State hence, the outsourcing employees are not entitled for the benefit of regularisation.

9. No other argument is raised.

10. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

11. Present petition stands dismissed.

12. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

05-05-2025  
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES  
Whether reportable: NO

