



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

688-1

CWP-1649-2006 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.09.2024

Sajjan Singh and Another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Kartikey Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Samrat Malik, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Challenge made in the present petition was to the order dated 20.01.2006, by which the benefit of scale already granted to the petitioners was ordered to be withdrawn, the operation of which was stayed by the Division Bench of this Court on 02.02.2006 and in the meantime, petitioners appear to have even retired, having been appointed in the year 1978 and 1983 respectively. In **Sudarshan Kumar Sharma vs. The State of Punjab and others**, CWP-837-2005, the Division Bench of this Court vide its judgment dated on 21.02.2013, held thus:

“The petitioner was appointed as Sanitary Inspector, Municipal Committee, Ludhiana and he earned promotions from time to time. In the year 1994, he was promoted as Superintendent Vaccination. Thereafter, in the year 1997, he was given promotion to the post of Registrar (Births & Deaths), Municipal Corporation, Ludhiana vide orders dated 28.5.1997. Subsequently, show cause notice dated 16.1.2003 was issued to him which culminated in his reversion from the post of Registrar (Births & Deaths). Challenging these orders, the petitioner filed the instant writ petition. The petitioner also prayed for interim stay of operation of the reversion orders.

Interim orders were passed in his favour by this Court. Under the umbrella of the said stay orders, the petitioner continued to work as Registrar (Births & Deaths) and has since retired as well from that post on 31.12.2009. As the petitioner, on account of stay order, continued to work as Registrar (Births & Deaths) and has even retired from that post, it is not necessary to go into the validity of the orders impugned in this petition.

Retiral benefits, if not paid, shall be released to the petitioner as if the petitioner had retired as Registrar (Births & Deaths).

The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.” (Emphasis Supplied)

3. Learned State counsel being unable to controvert the factual position and draw out any distinctive the above, the present petition is disposed of in terms of the judgment passed in **Sudarshan Kumar Sharma** (supra).

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

17.09.2024
M.Kamra

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