
(2026) 02 P&H CK 1844

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 20462 Of 2002

Vinod Kumar And Anr

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Haryana And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 20-02-2026

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226, 227

Citation : (2026) 02 P&H CK 1844

Hon'ble Judges : Jagmohan Bansal, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Vishwajeet Singh, Akshit Pathania

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Jagmohan Bansal, J

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of orders dated 30.06.2022 whereby respondent has rejected their representation seeking reinstatement.

2. The petitioners No.1 and 2 joined Haryana Home Guards on 07.06.2010 and 01.07.1996 respectively. They worked with respondent till January' 2016. They submitted representations in 2021 seeking reinstatement but to no avail. They preferred CWP No.24615 of 2021 which was disposed of with a direction to respondent to decide their representation. The respondent by impugned order has rejected their representation. The respondent has held that petitioners did not work after 2016 and they are making false allegations of demand of bribe and filing representations. They have not filed representations as annexed with the writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners were not reengaged because they did not pay bribe to respondent No.6. Multiple FIRs have been registered against respondent No.6 which vindicates stand of the petitioners. They worked till 2016 and were discharged without any order. They

approached respondent many times but were not considered though similarly situated volunteers were considered and assigned duty.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent submits that stand of petitioners was always self-contradictory. They were alleging that there was demand of bribe whereas they never approached authorities for re-engagement. The representation of 2021 was never served upon respondents.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. The petitioners were engaged by respondent as volunteers. They were not holding any permanent post. They are claiming that they were not assigned duty after 2016 because of rigid and biased attitude of respondent No.6 whereas respondent is claiming that they never approached authorities after 2016. Be that as it may, this Court cannot direct respondent to re-instate or re-engage petitioners after 10 years, however, they may approach competent authority which if finds appropriate may re-engage them as per applicable terms & conditions and rules in force.

7. Disposed of in above terms.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.