



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

**CWP-21492-2012**

**Date of Decision: 02.07.2025**

(1)

Paramjit Kaur

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

....Respondent(s)

(2)

**CWP-25627-2012 (O & M)**

Paramjit Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

....Respondent(s)

AND

(3)

**CWP-278-2013**

**Date of Decision: 02.07.2025**

Sushma Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

....Respondent(s)



**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: Ms. Twinkle Verma, Advocate,  
for Mr. Amar Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner (in CWP-21492-2012).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Goklaney and Mr. Ashish Goklaney,  
Advocates, for the petitioner.  
(in CWP-25627-2012 and CWP-278-2013).

Mr. Avinit Avasthi, Addl. Standing Counsel,  
and Mr. Anmol Puri, Jr. Standing Counsel,  
for U.T., Chandigarh.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)**

1. By this common order, CWP Nos.21492, 25627 of 2012 and CWP-278-2013 are hereby adjudicated as issues involved and prayer sought in all the petitions are common.

2. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondent to grant one year extension as per notification dated 08.10.2012 issued by Government of Punjab.

3. The petitioners are retired Teachers. They were working with government aided private schools of U.T. Administration. They were not governed by Rules and Regulations applicable to employees of U.T. Administration. They have been made to retire on attaining the age of 58 years. They are claiming that Government of Punjab vide notification dated 08.10.2012 has provided for 2 years extension to its employees. The said notification is *ipso facto* applicable to U.T. Administration employees and



petitioners being employees of government aided schools are entitled to said benefit.

4. Learned counsels for the respondents submit that notification dated 08.10.2012 issued by Government of Punjab is not adopted by U.T. Administration for its government aided private school Teachers. The petitioners have already attained age of superannuation and they stand relieved.

5. The petitioners retired in 2011-12. They are claiming extension of one year on the basis of notification dated 08.10.2012 issued by Government of Punjab. Firstly, it was discretion of the employer to grant extension. It was not matter of right of the employee. Secondly, a period of 13 years from the date of superannuation of petitioners has passed away, thus, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its writ jurisdiction.

6. Dismissed.

7. The petitioners at this stage submit that they may be granted liberty to approach authorities. This order would not inhibit them to approach the authorities for the redressal of their grievance, if any.

02.07.2025  
shivani

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)  
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking  
Whether reportable

Yes  
No