



CWP-5650-2023

-1-

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

Serial No.258

**CWP-5650-2023
Decided on:03.11.2025**

Suksham Goyal

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Rishabh Jain, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Varun Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Head of Department (HoD) Electrical Engineering.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner was considered for promotion alongwith other senior lecturers, and the final recommendation was approved by the Government upto the level of Chief Minister on 06.10.2022, as is apparent from the notings appended as Annexure P-7. Her name figured at serial no. 12 in Table III of the approved list. Thereafter, the Department issued an order dated 28.11.2022, promoting Senior Lecturers as HoDs in various disciplines as per the Haryana Technical Education Department (Group A) Service Rules, 2019 in the pay scale of FPL-16. However, the



petitioner was not promoted as HoD on the ground disciplinary proceedings under Rule 7 of the Haryana Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2016 Rules') were contemplated against her. Later, she was issued a chargesheet also. During pendency of the petition, the Government has decided to drop the chargesheet, and a decision to that effect has been conveyed to her vide memo dated 02.09.2025, Annexure P-9. Accordingly, there is no obstacle in considering the petitioner for promotion now.

3. Learned State counsel has received instructions from the Department vide memo dated 14.10.2025, which is retained on the case file as Annexure 'A'. Referring the same, he contends that the petitioner will be considered for promotion to the post of HoD with other Senior Lecturers in the next proposal to be submitted to the Government for consideration. It will take three to four months.

4. Heard.

5. Considering the facts on record, it is apparent that the only reason the petitioner could not be promoted to the post of HoD vide order dated 28.11.2022, was the contemplation of disciplinary proceedings against her under Rule 7 of the 2016 Rules at that time. However, the chargesheet subsequently issued has now been dropped, as conveyed to her vide memo dated 02.09.2025. Accordingly, there is no impediment in promoting the petitioner as HoD on the basis of order dated 28.11.2022. And not doing so would be unjust and unreasonable.

**CWP-5650-2023****-3-**

6. In view thereof, the petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to promote the petitioner with effect from 28.11.2022 with all consequential benefits except payment of salary, within two months of receiving a certified copy of this order.

03.11.2025*Mehak***(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE***Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No**Whether reportable? Yes/No*