



CWP-12980-2025

-1-

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

135

CWP-12980-2025

Date of Decision: 07.05.2025

Usha Rani

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Rajeev Godara, Advocate for the petitioner

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to grant the petitioner a deemed date of promotion to the petitioner with effect from 12.05.1995, i.e., from the date her juniors have been promoted, and to re-fix the pay and revise the pension.

2. Learned counsel contended that the petitioner superannuated from service in 2013 and is entitled to claim promotion from the date her juniors were promoted in terms of settled proposition of law to that effect. He has also referred to the judgment, dated 03.03.2020, passed in CWP-4172-2015 titled *Parveen Bala v. State of Haryana and others*, whereby the pay of similarly situated employee was stepped-up at par with that of her junior, and the petitioner therein was held entitled to the consequential arrears with interest.

3. Apparently, the petition has been filed after unexplained delay of about three decades. The petitioner joined service on *ad hoc* basis on 17.09.1980 and was subsequently regularised as well as promoted on 18.07.1998. She



superannuated therefrom in 2013, however during service she never claimed deemed date of promotion with effect from 12.05.1995, and cannot be allowed to do so at this stage after about twelve years of superannuation. Reliance upon the order dated 03.03.2020, passed in *Parveen Bala* case (*supra*) is also misplaced, as it is on different facts; the petitioner therein had been given the benefit of stepping-up of pay by the Department on its own. Delay in filing the case was not an issue. Besides, only because some other employee had been granted the relief, it would not entitle the petitioner to claim parity and seek the same benefit.

4. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition, and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

07.05.2025
Payal

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