

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.4404 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision:03.08.2023

Harish Kumar and others		...Petitioners
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

2. CWP No.5567 of 2015 (O&M)

Dhoom Singh and others		...Petitioners
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

3. CWP No.16010 of 2016 (O&M)

Ramesh Chander and others		...Petitioners
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

4. CWP No.1756 of 2017

Vijay Kumar		...Petitioner
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

5. CWP No.27252 of 2016 (O&M)

Ram Kumar and others		...Petitioners
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

6. CWP No.19712 of 2015 (O&M)

Sardeesh Kumar and another		...Petitioners
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

7. CWP No.24987 of 2016 (O&M)

Satbir Singh and another		...Petitioners
	Vs	
State of Haryana and others		...Respondents

8. CWP No.14238 of 2016 (O&M)

Rajesh Kumar

Vs

...Petitioner

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

9. CWP No.15260 of 2016 (O&M)

Ramniwas Upholster and another

Vs

...Petitioners

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

10. CWP No.18554 of 2016 (O&M)

Anand Kumar

Vs

...Petitioner

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

11. CWP No.16648 of 2016

Ran Singh

Vs

...Petitioner

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP No.4404 of 2015.

Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP No.24987 of 2016.

Mr. J.S. Dahiya, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP No.5567 of 2015.

Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP Nos.16010, 14238, 18554 of 2016.

Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No.1756 of 2017.

Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP No.27252 of 2016.

Mr. Umesh Pandey, Advocate for
Mr. Ravi Sodhi, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP No.19712 of 2015.

Mr. Amarjit Beniwal, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP No.15260 of 2016.

Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Kharb, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP No.16648 of 2016.

Mr. Sourabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Chandni Bajaj, Advocate for
Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate
for respondent No.4-CBI.

Mr. R.S. Kundu, Advocate and
Mr. Anshul Chahal, Advocate
for respondent No.5 in CWP No.5567 of 2015.

-.-

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

By this common order, twelve petitions which involve the same question of law on similar facts are being decided.

Learned counsel for the parties agree that the question of law raised in the present petition has already been decided by the Coordinate Bench while deciding bunch of petitions, vide order dated 17.11.2016, which decision has already been upheld by the Division Bench in LPA No.880 of 2017.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that along with the bunch of petitions, CWP No.14676 of 2016 titled *Joginder Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others* was decided, which was filed by the similarly situated employees claiming similar relief, hence, the present petition needs to be allowed in the same terms and conditions.

Learned State counsel submits that whatever benefit has been granted by the Coordinate Bench while passing order in *Joginder Singh's case* (supra) will be given to the petitioners also and the respondent-State has no objection in case the present petitions are disposed of in the same terms and conditions as *Joginder Singh's case* (supra).

Keeping in view the above as prayed by the respective parties, present petitions are disposed of in terms of decision rendered by the Coordinate Bench in CWP No.14676 of 2016 decided on 17.11.2016 titled *Joginder Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that during the pendency of the present petitions and after decision rendered in *Joginder Singh's case* (supra), the respondents have issued instructions on 07.02.2019, according to which also, petitioners are also entitled for certain benefits, hence, liberty be given to petitioners to approach the respondents to claim similar benefit by filing appropriate representation.

Learned State counsel submits that in case any representation is received from the petitioners raising any claim on the basis of instructions dated 07.02.2019, the same will be decided in accordance with law by passing appropriate speaking order within a period of three months on receipt of any such representation.

Keeping in view the above, no further orders are required to be passed on the said plea, as the petitioners will be at liberty to file appropriate representation in case they intend to do so.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

August 03, 2023

Pankaj*

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