



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CWP-1840-2016

Date of decision: 24.03.2025

MOHINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present:- Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed for seeking directions to the respondent to regularize the services of the petitioner being a left over case.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present writ petition has been filed for claiming the benefit of regularization w.e.f. 01.10.2003 as per the policy notified by the Government. He contends that the respondent-Department had accepted the claim of the petitioner, however, on account of pendency of a batch of writ petitions, the benefit of regularization, even though formally ordered, was not implemented in favour of the petitioner. He contends that the said writ petitions were decided in favour of the petitioners against which the State of Haryana had preferred *Letters Patent Appeal No. 688 of 2021* titled as “*State of Haryana and*



**CWP-1840-2016**

-2-

*others versus Balwinder Singh and others*". The said Letters Patent Appeal preferred by the State has been dismissed by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 02.12.2022 and the judgment passed by the Single Bench has been upheld.

Counsel for the respondent-State is not in a position to seriously dispute the applicability of the said judgment.

The present writ petition is accordingly allowed in terms of the judgment dated **02.12.2022** passed in *LPA No. 688 of 2021 (supra)*.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**MARCH 24, 2025**

*Vishal sharma*

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