

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision : 08.09.2017

1.

CWP-23703-2015

Hari Ram Sharma and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

2.

CWP-24951-2015

Kishan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

3.

CWP-27386-2015

Virjanand and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

4.

CWP-25243-2015

Randhir Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

5.

CWP-25292-2015

Krishan Kumar and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

6.

CWP-912-2016

Dhani Ram and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Ms.Rahish Pahwa, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Hitesh Pandit, Addl.A.G. Haryana.

Ms.Anupama Sharma, Advocate
for respondents no.2 & 3.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that the case of the petitioners is otherwise covered by the judgment of this Court rendered in ***Nand Lal Taneja vs. Faridabad Complex Admiistration etc.*** (CWP no.673 of 1989) decided on 18.02.2008 (a copy of which is Annexure P-12) and the order of the Division Bench in LPA no.212 of 2008 (copy Annexure P-13), with the SLP in that litigation also having been dismissed on 09.11.2009, vide the order Annexure P-14.

that upon a second set of petitioners seeking the same relief having approached this Court by way of CWP no.13473 of 2011, which was allowed in terms of the judgment in Nand Lal Tanejas' case (supra) on 21.05.2012, with the LPA filed against that petition having also been dismissed, the SLP filed by the respondents is still pending in the Supreme Court. It is, however, admitted that there is no stay operating as regards the judgment of this Court.

Consequently, these petitions are allowed in the same terms as in ***Nand Lal Tanejas'*** case(supra), subject, naturally, to the outcome of the SLP stated to be pending. However, the petitioners in these petitions having approached this Court in the year 2015-16, all arrears that would flow from the benefit granted to them, shall be restricted to a period of 38 months prior to filing of the petition, in each petitioners' case.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

September 08, 2017.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No