



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

**LPA No.1516 of 2024
Date of Decision: 17.03.2025**

N.K. Bajaj

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Dr. Deepak Jindal, Advocate
for the appellant.

* * * *

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA J.(Oral)

The appellant has preferred this appeal assailing the order dated 07.05.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge whereby the writ petition was dismissed, preferred by him in the year 1995 wherein he claimed that he should be granted the selection grade from the date respondents No.3 to 9 had been granted i.e w.e.f 12.06.1992 as they were junior to him. The writ petition remained pending and it appears that on 17.05.2017, an affidavit was filed dated 13.11.2017 by the Joint Director informing that speaking order has been passed with regard to the inter se seniority and after considering the various representations it had reached to the conclusion that the 9th respondent was senior to the appellant and a revised order was passed on 16.08.2002. The selection grade granted to the employees was also modified vide order dated 14.08.2003 and the 9th respondent was given the selection grade w.e.f. 20.10.1993 in place of 12.06.1992.



2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the revised seniority list dated 16.08.2002 was never published nor conveyed to the appellant. The revised modification order of the selection grade dated 14.08.2003 was also not informed to the appellant and for the first time only it was brought to the knowledge of the Court in the year 2017. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the orders have resulted in the very claim raised by the appellant as redundant which cannot be allowed to be done behind his back.

3. We have considered the submissions. The orders of 2002 and 2003 (*supra*) cannot be said to be not in knowledge of the appellant who was actively pursuing his petition since 1995 and would, therefore, be having full knowledge of the orders which are in public domain. Even if he has chosen not to challenge those orders, we find that the grievance of the appellant is adequately redressed as so called his juniors have also been granted the selection grade from the same date as has been granted to the appellant. He, therefore, cannot claim anything more and over & above them in any manner. The petition has, thus, been rightly dismissed.

4. With the aforesaid observations, the present LPA is dismissed accordingly.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

March 17, 2025
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No