



115

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

LPA-1568-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.01.2025

GAJRAJ SINGH

.....Appellant (s)

V/s.**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

.....Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate for the appellant.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant assails order dated 22.05.2024 passed by the learned Single Bench in CWP-3230-2021, whereby, his claim for increase in salary as has been granted to the persons junior to him and for granting him benefit of ACP, from the date the other persons were granted the same, was rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that in the seniority list published for the post of Sub Inspector, the appellant was placed above the two persons i.e. Naresh Kumar and Satpal, who were promoted subsequent to him on the said post. He, therefore, had a right to claim stepping-up of his salary at par with the said two persons. He submits that the benefit of ACP was also required to be given to the appellant from an earlier date and therefore, order passed by the learned Single Bench rejecting his claim, is erroneous.

3. We have considered the submissions of learned counsel for the appellant and find that the appellant has filed CWP-3230-2021 with a prayer for quashing order dated 03.12.2019 passed by respondent No.4, to grant all consequential benefits of service w.e.f. 13.08.1985 and to grant



the salary/pension at par with his juniors with all consequential benefits along with interest.

4. The learned Single Bench found that while he was initially appointed on 24.04.1985, his services were terminated and discontinued on 24.06.1986 whereafter, he was given a fresh appointment on 11.02.1987 on *ad hoc* basis and his services were subsequently regularized on 09.08.1987. The period of service, therefore, has to be counted from the date when he was appointed on *ad hoc* basis i.e. 11.02.1987. He was given benefits of 1st ACP on completion of 10 years’ service, treating his service from the date of 11.02.1987 onwards and he continued to get the benefit. The claim of stepping-up was also found to be not made out as the appellant’s services have to be counted w.e.f. 11.02.1987 only.

5. Therefore, we do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by the learned Single Bench as merely, because of the appellant having seniority on the promotion post, the same would not make a difference for stepping-up.

6. In view of the aforesaid, this LPA stands **dismissed**.

7. All pending applications in this case are disposed of accordingly.

[SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA]
JUDGE

[MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA]
JUDGE

January 28, 2025
Ess Kay

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