



204

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

CWP-12706-2015**Date of Decision: 01.12.2025**

Mohinder Singh and Another

...Petitioner

Versus

The Chairman, Chandigarh Housing Board and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSALPresent:- Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner (Through V.C.).Mr. Arjun Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.1 to 5.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of letter dated 28.06.2013 whereby respondent invited names of their juniors for regularization and letter dated 26.04.2013 whereby their claim was rejected.

2. Learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that private respondents were juniors to petitioners in 2013. Both set of employees were Work Charge. The respondent regularized private respondents in 2013. The pay scale of Work Charge during 2013 was 5910 to 20200+ 1900 GP whereas pay scale of Work Charge (Regular) was 5910-20200+ 2400 GP.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents on 07.11.2019 made a statement that petitioners have already been regularized, thus, petition has

rendered infructuous. The petitioners pressed their petition and matter came up for consideration before this Court on 11.08.2025. On the said date, the following order was passed:

“The petitioners are claiming that they were senior to private respondents as Work Charge employees, however, respondent made private respondents senior and further regularized them prior to the petitioners. As per reply, the petitioners were also given scale, thus, no financial loss was caused to the petitioners.

Both sides are directed to clarify loss, if any, caused to petitioners if their contention is accepted.

Adjourned to 29.08.2025.”

4. Pursuant to aforesaid order, both sides have filed their affidavit. The respondent is claiming that few employees were wrongly granted ACP prior to 2018. No ACP has been granted post 25.04.2018. The petitioners have further been promoted as Junior Engineer (Building) w.e.f. 15.09.2025. They, at this stage, cannot be promoted retrospectively.

5. From the perusal of record, it is evident that there was slight difference in the pay scale of Work Charge and Work Charge (Regular). The petitioners have filed instant petition seeking regularization. They have already been regularized and further promoted as Junior Engineer. The principle grievance of the petitioners stands redressed. This Court does not find it appropriate to further dilate on all the grievances of the petitioners.

6. ***Disposed of.***

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

01.12.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No