



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CM-6292-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-4241-2007
Date of decision: 10.07.2025

SONA DEVI

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Deepak Sonak, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CM-6292-CWP-2025

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed as prayed for.

Since the main case is on the regular Board of this Court, the same is taken up on Board today itself.

CWP-4241-2007

Prayer made in the present writ petition was for seeking directions to the respondents to regularize the petitioner who had completed



**CM-6292-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-4241-2007**

-2-

more than 16 years of service, on the basis of the instructions issued by the respondents.

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was appointed as a Beldar-cum-Mali on daily wages basis with the respondent Department in the year 1990 at a consolidated salary of Rs. 750/- per month. She was later directed to work under the control of respondent No.4-Divisional Forest Officer, Kaithal Division in May 1996. It is contended that the Government issued a policy of regularization of Group 'D'/Daily wages employees in 1993 for the persons who had completed five years of service. The same was followed by the policy dated 07.03.1996 whereby the Government of Haryana extended the benefit of regularization to Group 'D'/Daily Wages employees who had completed five years of service as on 31.01.1996. The aforesaid prescribed period was reduced to three years instead of five years vide the modification issued on 18.03.1996.

3. Alleging that one Satbir Singh son of Ramdhari, who was junior to the petitioner and had been working with the respondent Department since 1995, was regularized on 10.08.2005 and the name of the petitioner was not considered for regularization, a legal notice dated 20.05.2006 was sent by the petitioner. The respondents, however, did not take any decision on the same. The instant writ petition had thus been filed and the same was admitted in May, 2009.

4. Now, the CM-6292-CWP-2025 has been filed by the petitioner wherein, it has been specifically averred that the case of the petitioner is



CM-6292-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-4241-2007

-3-

covered by the judgment passed by this Court in the matter of ***“Balwinder Singh and others versus State of Haryana and others”*** passed in CWP-2009 of 2016 decided on 31.01.2020 involving identical facts and law. The Special Leave Petition preferred by the State of Haryana against the said judgment has also been dismissed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court and as such, the said judgment has attained finality. The same has also been relied upon by this Court in order dated 04.02.2025 passed in CWP-28839 of 2018 titled as ***“Raj Karan and others versus State of Haryana and others”***. He thus contends that the present writ petition may be disposed of in terms of the aforesaid judgment passed by this Hon’ble Court since the case of the petitioner is squarely covered under the same.

5. Counsel for the respondent-State is not in a position to dispute the specific plea argued as aforesaid or with respect to applicability of the judgment in the matter of ***Balwinder Singh and others (supra)*** on the facts of the petitioner herein.

6. The present writ petition is accordingly disposed of at this stage with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization, after taking into consideration the law including the judgment of this Court in the matter of ***“Balwinder Singh and others versus State of Haryana and others”*** as well as the order dated 04.02.2025 passed in the matter of ***“Raj Karan and others versus State of Haryana and others”*** and to pass a fresh order within a period of three months of a receipt of certified copy of this order. In the event of the petitioner being found entitled, the



**CM-6292-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-4241-2007**

-4-

benefits admissible to the petitioner shall be released within a further period of two months thereafter, failing which, the petitioner shall become entitled to interest @ 6% per annum from the date of filing of the instant writ petition. Such additional financial liability may be recovered by the respondent-State from the erring official, as per law.

JULY 10, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No