



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**
205

CWP-4999-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.11.2025

Harjinder Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. P.K. Goklaney, Advocate
with Mr. Ashish Goklaney, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manbir Singh Batth, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner. Further prayer has been made to direct the respondent/Board to release all the consequential benefits to the petitioner along with interest @ 9% per annum from the date it became due till its actual realization.

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4 has filed status report by way of affidavit of Madan Gopal, Administrative Officer, Punjab Pollution Control Board, Nabha Board, Patiala, today in the Court, which is taken on record. Learned counsel for respondents No.2



to 4, at the outset, submits that the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present petition has been redressed and the petitioner has been regularized vide order dated 11.11.2024.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been given regularization with effect from the date of order. He further submits that the pay scale for the post of Clerk and benefit of annual increment has been given to the petitioner only on 28.07.1998, although the petitioner has joined the respondent/Board on 12.10.1996. As such, the petitioner is entitled to the admissible benefits from the date of her joining and not from 28.07.1998, by counting her past service as per the judgments rendered by this Court in *Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab, CWP No.2371 of 2010* and *State of Haryana and others v. Jai Bhagwan, LPA No.1892 of 2019*.

4. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4 submits that if the petitioner submits a representation before the competent authority, the same shall be considered and all admissible benefits shall be extended to her by passing a speaking order, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of such representation.

5. In the wake of the statement made by learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, the present petition is disposed of. Respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide the petitioner's representation, if submitted and grant all admissible consequential benefits to her by passing a well-reasoned and speaking order strictly in terms of the



judgments rendered by this Court in *Harbans Lal’s case (supra)* and *Jai Bhagwan’s case (supra)*, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the representation.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
yakub

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