



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CWP-8455-2025
Decided On: 26.03.2025

SURENDER KUMAR

.....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Ms. Sangeeta Yadav, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to release arrears of revised pension to the petitioner on behalf of his late father with effect from 01.01.2006 to 31.12.2015, in compliance with the judgment dated 25.07.2012, rendered in CWP-19266-2010 titled *Satyapal Yadav and another v. State of Haryana and another*.

2. Learned counsel has referred to a letter, Annexure P-9, issued by Principal, Government College, Nahar, to the Director General, Higher Education, informing as under:

It is to inform you that pension of Sh. Puran Singh had worked xx over college w.e.f. 05.09.1977 to 22.06.1992 and this college was taken over by the Haryana Govt. on 23.06.1992. His pension is to be revised w.e.f. 01.01.2006 as per Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court decision.

You are therefore, requested to kindly fix his pension as on 01.01.2006 to that the pension revision case may be sent to the Accountant General (A&E) Haryana for further necessary action. His service book may also be sent at the earliest possible for further necessary action.



It has been contended that the petitioner is entitled to arrears of revised pension in terms of the letter. Besides, a similarly placed employee, Late Hoshiar Singh Yadav, has already been released revised pension vide office order dated 25.03.2022, Annexure P-10, and the petitioner is also entitled to the benefit on similar ground.

3. Heard.

4. It is apparent on record that the petitioner's father was appointed as Lecturer in Geography on 05.09.1977, and worked upto 31.05.2022. Earlier he approached this Court by filing CWP-4356-2021, seeking a direction to the respondents to count the period of probation for pension, gratuity and other benefits. The petition was disposed of vide order dated 24.02.2021, directing the respondents to decide his legal notice by passing a speaking order. Thereupon, his service during the period of probation was counted for pensionary benefits. The petitioner's father kept on getting the pension accordingly, and expired on 01.05.2021, and his mother also expired some time later. Thereafter, the petitioner being a legal heir, raised the claim for benefit of revised pension with effect from 01.01.2006 to 31.12.2015, by submitting representations.

5. It is also apparent on record that the petitioner's father was never given the benefit of revised pension either by this Court or by the Department at any stage. The letter, Annexure P-9, cannot be a basis to grant the same to the petitioner at this stage. The case relied upon to claim the benefit, i.e., CWP-19266-2010 titled *Satyapal Yadav and another v. State of Haryana and another*, decided on 25.07.2012, has no relevance to the petitioner's case, and does not entitle him to arrears of revised pension in any manner. In that matter, the petitioners were held entitled to re-fixation/revision of



pension/family pension by placing them in pay band of ₹37400-67000 with AGP of ₹9000 with effect from 01.01.2006, since they had admittedly completed three years of service in the pre-revised corresponding scale/selection grade of ₹12000-18300. However, the petitioner's father himself never raised any grievance for revised pay or pension in the selection grade; the only claim raised by him was for counting the probation period of service towards pensionary benefits, which was accepted by the Department.

6. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition and it stands dismissed *in limine*.

26.03.2025

Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No