



CWP-11764-2016

1

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

(207)

CWP-11764-2016

Date of Decision : December 12, 2024

Sukhjinder Kaur

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that the service which the petitioner rendered in the Government of Haryana prior to the joining of post with the Government of Punjab, be treated as a valid service for computing the qualifying service for pensionary benefits.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the question of law as to whether the service rendered in the State of Haryana can be taken into account as a valid service to be treated as qualifying service for computing the pensionary benefits, has already been decided by the Division Bench of this Court while deciding *CWP No.7694 of 1998 titled as Ranjit Nahar vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 02.08.2000* and



CWP-11764-2016

2

thereafter once again, in ***CWP No.5021 of 2012 titled as Gurdial Singh vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 03.05.2019*** wherein, it has been held that service rendered with the State of Haryana cannot be taken into account as a qualifying service for computing the pensionary benefits after the employee retired from the service of the Government of Punjab.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents has not been able to rebut the settled principle of law settled by the Division Bench in ***Ranjit Nahar's case (supra)*** as well as in ***Gurdial Singh's case (supra)***.

4. Once, the benefit of service rendered in the State of Haryana has not been held to be a qualifying service after an employee joined the State of Punjab and retired from the said State, the benefit of the service rendered by the petitioner in the State of Haryana before joining the State of Punjab, cannot be treated as qualifying service.

5. The detailed reasons have already been given by the Division Bench of this Court in ***Ranjit Nahar's case (supra)***, which are not being reiterated hence, keeping in view the decision of the Division Bench in ***Ranjit Nahar's case (supra)*** and in ***Gurdial Singh's case (supra)***, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

6. Further, this Court also by placing reliance upon the judgment in ***Ranjit Nahar's case (supra)*** as well as in ***Gurdial Singh's case (supra)***, has also dismissed the identical claim in ***CWP No.14558 of 2018 titled as Hardev Singh vs. State of Punjab and others and other connected cases, decided on 05.08.2024.***

7. Further, as per the clause-17 of the appointment order of the petitioner, no benefit of the earlier service in the State of Haryana was to be



CWP-11764-2016

3

given to the petitioner even on being appointed.

8. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

December 12, 2024
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

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