



CWP-6212-2020 (O&M) & CWP-1317-2015

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225+209/3

CWP-6212-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.09.2025

Parveen Bala

...Petitioner

Versus

Panjab University

...Respondent

With

CWP-1317-2015

Anil Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Jagdeep Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CWP-6212-2020)

Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate for the petitioners
(in CWP-1317-2015)

Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate
for respondent-Panjab University

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from *CWP-6212-2020*.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking directions to respondents to regularize her.

3. On 19.08.2025, this Court passed the following order: -



“1. The petitioner claims that she joined Panjab University as Counter Clerk in 1990-91. She continued to work till 2002 and was terminated on 30.09.2002. She cleared written test conducted by respondent on two occasions i.e. in 1991 and 1999. She approached Labour Court against her termination. The Labour Court vide award dated 07.01.2010 ordered to reinstate her with 40% back wages. She was held entitled to reinstatement and her termination was declared illegal. She again joined on 04.06.2010. The respondent preferred writ petition before this Court assailing award of Labour Court. The said petition was dismissed on 09.07.2010. The respondent further preferred Intra-Court Appeal which was dismissed vide order dated 21.11.2011. The respondent framed regularization policy in 2011 whereby it was required that employee must have completed 10 years service. The said policy was modified whereby employees who had completed 3650 days by 31.12.2010 were made eligible. The respondent is claiming that neither petitioner completed 10 years consecutive service as per first policy nor 3650 days service as per modified policy, thus, she could not be regularized. She would be considered for regularization as per third policy which is under consideration before this Court.

2. The petitioner is claiming that as per award passed by Labour Court, she was reinstated with 40% back wages. She was granted back wages, thus, she should be deemed to be in service during the said period.

3. Adjourned to 11.09.2025.

4. To be taken up after urgent list.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this Court vide orders dated 05.08.2025 passed in ***Dildeep Singh and others v. Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and others, CWP No.22747 of 2017*** and dated 22.01.2025 in ***Sanjeev Kumar v. State of Haryana and others, CWP No.10071 of 2022***, relying upon judgments of Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Secretary, State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi, (2006) 4 SCC 1; Union of***



India v. K. Velajagan and others, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 837 and *Jaggo v. Union of India and others, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826* has ordered to regularize employees who were working for more than 10 years. Recently, Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Dharm Singh and others v. State of U.P. and another, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735*, has ordered to regularize daily wage Class-IV employees. The Supreme Court has further ordered to create supernumerary posts.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-University submits that University has not yet finalized its regularization policy, however, he expressed his inability to controvert applicability of afore-cited judgments to the instant case.

6. Claim of petitioners is squarely covered by afore-cited judgments especially *Jaggo (Supra)* and *Dharam Singh and others (Supra)*. The instant petitions deserve to be allowed and accordingly hereby allowed. The petitioners shall be deemed to be regularized on the expiry of six weeks from today, if not regularized prior to said date by competent authority. The petitioners shall be entitled to counting of past service and other benefits as per judgments of this Court in *Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab, CWP No.2371 of 2010* and *State of Haryana and others v. Jai Bhagwan, LPA No.1892 of 2019*.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

11.09.2025
Mohit Kumar

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