

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

Date of Decision: 20.09.2022

**Sr. No.110+263 CM-14545-CWP-2022 in/and
CWP-11582-2018 (O&M)**

Pushpa Devi and another	Versus	 Petitioners
State of Haryana and others		... Respondent

Sr. No.355 CWP-14218-2022

Raj Bala	Versus	 Petitioner
State of Haryana and others		... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate
 for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rahul Verma, Advocate for
Mr. Sant Kashyap, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

**CM-14545-CWP-2022 in
CWP-11582-2018**

The present application has been filed for placing on record the Annexures P-32 to P-38 so as to contend that the relief being claimed by the petitioner(s) in the present petition, has already been extended to the similarly situated employees by the respondents themselves as well as the fact that the claim of the petitioner(s) is covered by the decision of this Court

CM-14545-CWP-2022 in/and
CWP-11582-2018 (O&M) along with similar petition

-2-

rendered in **CWP No.7778 of 2013** decided on 16.01.2020, titled as
Hanuman versus State of Haryanan and others.

Application is allowed with all just exceptions and Annexures
P-32 to P-38 are taken on record.

CWP-11582-2018 (O&M) and
CWP-14218-2022

By this common order, two writ petitions bearing
CWP No.11582 of 2018 and CWP No.14218 of 2022 shall be disposed of as
both of them involve similar question of law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the claim of
the petitioner(s) for the grant of benefit of pensionary benefits has been
rejected by the respondents, which benefit has already been extended by the
respondents to similarly situated employees vide orders which have been
annexed as Annexures P-32 to P-38.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that the
prayer of the petitioner(s) is covered by the decision rendered by this Court
in **CWP No.7778 of 2013** decided on 16.01.2020, titled as **Hanuman versus**
State of Haryanan and others.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submits that even
the arrears of salary for which the petitioner(s) are entitled for while being in
service, have also not been released, for which an appropriate direction be
also given to the respondents.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in case the petitioner(s) feel that their case is covered by the decision rendered in **Hanuman's case (supra)** and an appropriate representation is made by the petitioner(s) claiming the said relief by placing reliance on the said judgment, due consideration will be given to their representation by the department and an appropriate order will be passed within a period of 4 weeks from the receipt of any such representation and if it is found that the petitioner(s) are similarly situated to the employees who have been extended the relief vide Annexures P-32 to P-38 or their claim is covered by the decision rendered in **Hanuman's case (supra)** and further they are eligible for the arrears of salary for the period while being in service, appropriate relief will be given to the petitioner(s) being similarly situated.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that keeping in view the said statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present petitions may kindly be disposed of as having been not pressed any further at this stage, with liberty to the petitioner(s) to approach the respondents by filing appropriate representation.

Ordered accordingly.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected file.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

20.09.2022
Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No