

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

110

CWP-26828-2023

Date of Decision :-04.12.2023

Suresh Pal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Manish Giri, Advocate for
Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, challenge is to order dated 04.10.2023 (Annexure P/13) by which, the claim of the petitioner for the grant of benefit of promotion has been rejected by the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the similarly situated employees had already been given the benefit of promotion and the petitioner is only claiming the benefit which has already been extended to the said similarly situated employees and once it has already come on record that similarly situated employees have been granted the benefit of promotion, declining the said benefit to the petitioner is bad in law.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that though, in the impugned order, it has been mentioned that the said benefit of promotion has wrongly been extended to the similarly situated employees and the same needs to be withdrawn but even after the expiry of more than two months, no

action has been taken by the respondents, which is causing prejudice to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and on instructions from Ms. Sunita Rani, Superintendent, E-I and Ms. Sumitra Sharma and Mr. Arun Sharma, Accountant O/o Director General, State Transport, Haryana submits that the respondents have already started the process of issuing notices to the similarly situated employees, who had been granted the benefit of promotion against the rules so that their reply could be received and thereafter, an appropriate order could be passed and the said process will be completed within a period of two months from today.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement of the learned State counsel, present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh petition in case no action is taken by the respondents against the similarly situated employees.

7. Ordered accordingly.

December 04, 2023
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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