



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**
251

CWP-10325-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.12.2025

Mandeep
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Jasbir Singh Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Pankaj Midha, Advocate
for respondents No.4 and 6.

Mr. Shubham Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the impugned letter dated 06.02.2025 (Annexure P-14) and all subsequent letter whereby the petitioner has been asked to qualify the typing test in Hindi language. Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to grant the benefit of Haryana Contractual Employees (Security of Service) Act, 2024 (Annexure P-5) to the petitioner. Another prayer has been made to issue direction to the respondents to allow the petitioner to continue in service in Municipal Council, Jind, during the pendency of the writ petition on the same



parameter keeping in view the decision dated 27.12.2024 and 15.01.2025 (Annexures P-20 and P-21, respectively) of the State Government vide which it has been directed not to relieve such contractual employees covered under Haryana Contractual Employees (Security of Service) Act, 2024.

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.4 and 6, at the outset, submits that the grievance raised by the petitioner in the instant writ petition has been substantially redressed and he has been allowed to join his duty on 24.11.2025.

3. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that *status quo* was ordered by this Court on 08.04.2025 and the order has been complied with after a period of seven months. As such, the petitioner is entitled for the pay.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

5. The issue is no longer *res integra*. The principle of 'No Work, No Pay' would not be applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ram Kumar vs Union of India and others, (2015) 14 SCC 335, Union of India and others vs KV Jankiraman (1991) 4 SCC 109, Civil Appeal No. 6767 of 2013 titled as Deepali Gundu Surwase vs Kranti Junior Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya (D.Ed) and others*** and the judgment of the Calcutta High Court passed



in *FMA No.1235 of 2024 titled as Pamavathi Sakkinala vs The State of West Bengal and others.*

6. In the wake of the statement made by learned counsel for respondents No.4 and 6, the present petition is disposed of having been rendered infructuous.

7. It is, however, made clear that the petitioner shall be entitled to receive his pay and all consequential benefits from the date of the *status quo* order passed by this Court i.e. 08.04.2025.

8. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

04.12.2025

yakub

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