

2025:PHHC:049400



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

236+115

Date of decision: 09.04.2025

CWP-8456-2023

Shelza vs. State of Punjab and Others

CWP-7475-2024

Sheenam vs. State of Punjab and others

CWP-9747-2025

Varundeep vs. State of Punjab and Others

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Sahil Matharoo, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP-8456-2023 and CWP-7475-2024.

Mr. D.S.Rawat, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CWP-9747-2025.

Mr. Amarpeet Singh Bains, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.P.S.Mann, Advocate,
for respondent No.4 in CWP-8456-2023.

Mr. Ankur Sharma, Advocate for
respondent No.4 in CWP-7475-2024.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. These cases involve similar issues and therefore, are being disposed of together and for the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from CWP-8456-2023.

2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was appointed on 13.01.2009 on Administrative/Non-Teaching Post of Accountant on contract basis and has been continuing as such. She is seeking regularization in terms of the Notification dated 24.01.2023, issued based on the judgment passed in **Balbir Singh and others vs. State of Punjab**

and others, CWP-7764-2015, and connected cases, decided on 04.12.2018, against which LPA has been dismissed on 29.03.2022. She is similarly circumstanced to the said employees, however, only the premise of not being the petitioner therein, the claim has been rejected. Reliance is placed on **Raman Kumar and others vs. Union of India**, SLP No.7898/2020, decided on 03.07.2023, **Om Parkash Banerjee vs. State of West Bengal and others**, Civil Appeal No.4210 of 2023, decided on 19.05.2023 and **State of Madhya Pradesh and others vs. Shyam Kumar Yadav and another**, SLP No.25609 of 2018, decided on 22.04.2024. Though there is no delay in her claim being raised, however, in case, the govt. comes to the conclusion otherwise, her arrears in terms of the judgments in **Saroj Kumari vs. State of Punjab** 1998(3) SCT 664 and **Union of India and others vs. Tarsem Singh** 2008(4) SCT 19 can be restricted to 38 months.

3. The aforesaid facts having been brought out, during the course of hearing, learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions, state that they would not be averse to have a relook at the matter and decide afresh, taking note of the aforesaid judgments, within a period of 6 months, uninfluenced by the order(s) impugned in the present case, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

4. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

5. The matter stands disposed of accordingly and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if

the orders are adverse to her interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to her and shall contain reasons, whereupon she shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

6. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected cases.

09.04.2025

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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