



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

CWP-30601-2025

Date of decision: 15.10.2025

Baljinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Rashika Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

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 consider the case of the petitioner for regularization of his job.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was initially appointed as a Beldar on contract basis in the year 1995 and after the completion of the project, 13 employees were absorbed into the Municipal Corporation, Amritsar by adopting pick and choose policy and several employees were junior to the petitioner were regularized on 29.11.2011 (Annexure P-17). The petitioner was reinstated in terms of the order passed by this Court in CWP No.24045 of 2011 and COCP No.538 of 2013 (Annexures P-



21 and P-22, respectively). The petitioner has not been regularized till date and approximately 100 posts of Beldar are currently lying vacant in the Municipal Corporation, Amritsar as discernible from Annexure P-25. He further relies upon the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Jaggo Vs. Union of India' 2025 AIR SC 296.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has limited her prayer to the extent that the present petition be treated as a comprehensive representation and the same be decided in a time bound manner by passing a speaking order after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab puts in appearance and accept notice on behalf of for respondent-State. Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate and Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate put in appearance and accept on behalf of respondents No.4 & 5, respectively.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition would be considered by passing a speaking order in accordance with the law by respondent(s)/competent authority.

7. Therefore, in view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the present writ petition is disposed of and the respondent(s)/competent authority is directed to treat this writ petition as a comprehensive representation and consider the claim of the petitioner in light of the precedent of similarly situated employees and pass a speaking order after affording him an opportunity to be heard, 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 petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondents.

8. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

15.10.2025

Neha

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