

Punjab-Haryana High Court

Dr Rakesh Kumar vs Chaudhary Devi Lal University Through ... on 6 July, 2026

CWP-19776-2026

1

HARYANA AT

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND

CHANDIGARH

126

CWP-19776-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.07.2026

Dr. Rakesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Chaudhary Devi Lal University and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present:

Mr. Parmender Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Nain, DAG, Haryana.

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner as an Assistant Professor (Law) on regular basis w.e.f. 14.01.2016 in the Department of Law at Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa with all consequential benefits i.e. seniority, pay fixation and arrears of salary, etc. along with interest @ 12% per annum from the date it became due till the date of actual realization.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Assistant Professor (Law) (Contractual) on 14.01.2016 pursuant to Advertisement No.ET-02/2015 after undergoing an open selection process before a duly constituted Selection Committee and the petitioner possesses all the qualifications MOHD YAKUB 2026.07.06 16:06 I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this document Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh.

prescribed under the UGC Regulations, including LL.M., UGC-NET and Ph.D. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been continuously discharging teaching, academic, examination and administrative duties identical to those performed by regular Assistant Professors, without any interruption, for more than 10 years. He further contends that the University itself, vide Notification dated 15.04.2021, reflected the petitioner amongst the contractual Assistant Professors having full workload and the Experience Certificate dated 24.02.2026 also acknowledges the petitioner's continuous service. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has rendered satisfactory and unblemished service while discharging the duties and perennial work is being extracted from the petitioner at par with his regular counterparts. The petitioner is neither engaged as a part-time worker nor as a casual labourer. There has been no complaint or adverse remarks against the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner's continuous engagement on contract basis is violative of the ratio of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jaggo v. Union of India and others 2025 AIR SC 296, Vinod Kumar and others v. Union of India (2024) 1 SCR 1230, Shripal and another vs Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad, 2025 SCC Online (SC) 221, Dharam Singh and Others v. State of U.P. and Another 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735, Bhola Nath vs State of Jharkhand, 2026 INSC 99, and judgment rendered by this Court in CWP-13015-2021 titled as Manak Singh and others vs State of Punjab and others, MOHD YAKUB 2026.07.06 16:06 I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this document Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh.

decided on 19.01.2026, which recognizes the right of long-serving contractual employees to be considered for regularization, however, the respondents have failed to take any decision in this regard. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that despite

submitting repeated representations dated 05.11.2024, 08.01.2025 and 25.03.2026, followed by several reminders and a legal notice dated 22.04.2025, the respondents have neither considered nor decided the petitioner's claim for regularization, thereby compelling the petitioner to approach this Court.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner is decided by respondent No.2 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to the respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision of the legal notice dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-7) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.2 is directed to consider the legal notice dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-7) filed by the petitioner and pass a speaking order in terms of the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jaggo's case ([supra](#)), [Vinod Kumar's case \(supra\)](#), Shripal's case ([surpa](#)), Dharam Singh's case ([supra](#)), Bhola MOHD YAKUB 2026.07.06 16:06 I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this document Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh.

Nath's case ([supra](#)) and [Manak Singh's case \(supra\)](#), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, 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 respondent No.2 as per the judgments rendered by 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.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

SINGH BRAR)

(HARPREET

JUDGE

06.07.2026

yakub

Yes/No

Whether

speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether

reportable:

MOHD YAKUB

2026.07.06 16:06

I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this document Punjab & Haryana High Court,
Chandigarh.