

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.1665 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.08.2017**

Budhi Singh & others	--Petitioners
Versus	
State of Punjab & others	--Respondents

2. CWP No.2053 of 2017 (O&M)

Budhy Parkash & others	--Petitioners
Versus	
State of Punjab & others	--Respondents

3. CWP No.2291 of 2017 (O&M)

Janak Raj & others	--Petitioners
Versus	
State of Punjab & others	--Respondents

4.CWP No.5184 of 2017 (O&M)

Gopal Ram & others	--Petitioners
Versus	
State of Punjab & others	--Respondents

5. CWP No.5241 of 2017 (O&M)

Mukti Parshad & others	--Petitioners
Versus	
State of Punjab & others	--Respondents

6. CWP No.5258 of 2017 (O&M)

Suresh Raj & others

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

--Respondents

7. CWP No.5489 of 2017 (O&M)

Rajinder Kumar & others

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. J.S. Mohri , Advocate,
Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate and
Mr. K.S. Kahlon, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Monica Chhibber Sharma, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

This order shall dispose of a bunch of petitions as the issue involved in this bunch of petitions is identical.

It is not in dispute that the petitioners in these petitions are Class IV daily wagers under the police department and whose services after their initial engagement had been duly regularized on different dates.

Claim set up in the writ petitions is to count their daily wage service rendered prior to regularization as qualifying service for the purpose of pensionary/retiral benefits so as to hold them entitled to the pensionary benefits as per the old GPF Scheme and which was applicable to the employees recruited in the Punjab Government

service prior to 01.01.2004.

Petitioners claim that the prayer made in these petitions would be covered in terms of judgment dated 31.08.2010 passed in **CWP No.2371 of 2010 titled as Harbans Lal Vs. State of Punjab.**

The judgment rendered in **Harbans Lal's case (supra)** stands affirmed up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

The State Government in the reply filed to the writ petition virtually concedes to the claim of the petitioners being covered under the judgment rendered in **Harbans Lal's case (supra)**. Further, it has been admitted that judgment in **Harbans Lal's case (supra)** has already been implemented. Furthermore, even subsequent judgments/orders passed by this Court in **CWP No.24472 of 2015 (Rajesh Kumar & others Vs. State of Punjab & others)**, **CWP No.10376 of 2014 (Subhash Chander & 79 others Vs. State of Punjab)** and **CWP No.20601 of 2014 (Rajinder Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab & others)**, which also involved identical issue have been implemented.

In the light of such conceded position, the present petitions are allowed in terms of judgment dated 31.08.2010 rendered by this Court in **CWP No.2371 of 2010 (Harbans Lal Vs. State of Punjab)**.

Disposed of.

09.08.2017

harjeet

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |