



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212-1

CWP-26438-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2025

Gurmeet Singh and others ...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

212-2

CWP-19404-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2025

Jatinder Singh and others ...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

212-3

CWP-24799-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2025

Baldev Singh ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

212-4

CWP-24802-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2025

Amrik Singh ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

212-5

CWP-1791-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2025

Harbhajan Singh and others ...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

**212-6**

CWP-22955-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.03.2025

Raj Kumar and others

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Anish Verma, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
 in CWP-24799-2022 and CWP-24802-2022.

Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
 in CWP-26438-2016 and CWP-19404-2021.

Mr. Ranjivan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
 in CWP-22955-2023 and CWP-1791-2020.

Mr. Sumit Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.3
 in CWP-1791-2020.

Mr. Pranav Chadha, Advocate for respondent No.4
 in CWP-26438-2016.

Mr. Arnav Mittal, Advocate for respondent No.4
 in CWP-19404-2021.

Mr. Anil K. Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.3
 in CWP-22955-2023.

Ms. Sanya Shangari, Advocate for
 Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate
 for respondents No.3, 5 and 6 in CWP-24799-2022 and
 for respondents No.3, 6 and 7 in CWP-24802-2022.

Mr. Balwinder Singh, AAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present writ petitions are being decided by a common order
 considering that the challenge in all these cases is to the circular/letter dated



25.08.2016 whereby the benefit of Leave Encashment has been declined to the petitioners for the period served by them on work-charged basis prior to their regularization.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that similar controversy was pending consideration before a Coordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP-19425-2017** titled as '**Sikander Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others**' which has since been decided vide judgment dated 10.02.2025 and the order declining similar relief to the petitioner therein has been set aside, holding him entitled for counting of the total length of service, which would also include the service rendered by him on work-charge basis before being regularized, as qualifying service for computing the entitlement of the leave encashment also.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State are not in a position to dispute or deny the aforesaid judgment.

In view of the above, the writ petitions are allowed in terms of the judgment **dated 10.02.2025** passed in **CWP-19425-2017** titled as '**Sikander Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others**'.

So far as **CWP-1791-2020** titled as '**Harbhajan Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others**' is concerned, there is an additional claim made qua petitioners No.1 and 2 for grant of salary. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners contends that the said petitioners may be granted liberty to make a representation for the aforesaid relief to the respondent-authorities.

Ordered accordingly.



Needless to mention that in the event such a representation is filed, the respondents are directed to take an expeditious decision thereupon and preferably within a period of 04 months of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In the event any amount is found payable, the same be released within a period of 02 months thereafter failing which respondent(s) shall be liable to pay interest @ 6% per annum from the date of filing of the writ petition till payment of the dues.

All pending civil misc. application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

19.03.2025

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No