

2025:PHHC:165485



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

CWP-7661-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.11.2025

Naresh Pal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S. Khehar, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 to 4.

Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. This Court, on 19.09.2025, had passed the hereinafter
extracted order:-

“Through the instant petition, challenge is to the order dated 10.02.2016 passed by District and Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, wherethrough his claim for continuation in service in view of Rule 4.23(1) of Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume II has been declined.

Learned counsel for the petitioner at the outset submits that though he is not covered under Rules for seeking condonation of break in service, however, the similar relief has been extended to one Kanwar Satpal by giving relaxation, and his case has not been considered in view of the above decision dated 16.09.2014, therefore, he is also entitled for the relaxation, and the said issue has not been examined so far.

Learned State counsel has also filed reply, and submitted that the issue of relaxation has not been considered on account of communication dated 28.03.2016, as made by Registrar General

2025:PHHC:165485



of this Court, wherethrough, the case of the petitioner was withdrawn for consideration.

Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 is directed to have apt instructions, as to whether, the petitioner's case can be considered in the light of the case of Kanwar Satpal, driver, who was granted relaxation in the Rules.

In case the Registrar of this Court, is of the view that the case of the petitioner requires re-consideration, and he is entitled for the parity as granted to one Kanwar Satpal, the necessary correspondence be made to the competent authority i.e. State Government.

Adjourned to 28.11.2025.”

2. Today, learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4 has apprised this Court that fresh recommendations have been made on 31.10.2025, to the Financial Commissioner and Principal Secretary to Government, Haryana, Administration of Justice Department, Jail and Judicial II branch, to re-consider the matter.

3. In view of the abovesaid supervening event, nothing substantial remains to be adjudicated in the matter. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, by issuing a Mandamus upon respondent No.1, to take a final decision on the recommendations (supra), in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No