IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(1) **CWP-4897-2017**
Date of Decision: 25.03.2025

NON-GOVT. COLLEGE MANAGEMENTS FEDERATION OF PUNJAB & CHANDIGARH

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party Name
2	CWP-12406-2017	RAMGARHIA COLLEGE OF EDUCATION V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
3	CWP-12627-2017	KAMLA NEHRU COLLEGE FOR WOMEN V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
4	CWP-13913-2017	RAMGARHIA COLLEGE V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
5	CWP-14106-2017	GURU NANAK BHAI LALO RAMGARHIA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
6	CWP-20576-2017	DAV COLLEGE TRUST AND MANAGEMENT SOCIETY AND ANR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
7	CWP-21739-2021	SD COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, KAPURTHALA V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
8	CWP-22106-2022	HINDU KANYA COLLEGE V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
9	CWP-25831-2021	KANYA MAHA VIDYALAYA AND ANR. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
10	CWP-29077-2022	DOABA COLLEGE JALANDHAR AND ORS. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
11	CWP-28198-2018	KHALSA COLLEGE GOVERNING COUNCIL & ORS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS
12	CWP-14532-2024	SMDRSD COLLEGE V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
13	CWP-16855-2024	KHALSA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN AND ANOTHER V/S DR. RAJWINDER KAUR AND OTHERS
14	CWP-17800-2024	GURU NANAK NATIONAL COLLEGE AND

		ANOTHER V/S JAGTAR SINGH AND OTHERS
15	CWP-4081-2007	RAJ GUPTA W/O SURESH KUMAR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS.
16	CWP-12550-2003	K.B. SINGH V/S STATE OF PB. ETC
17	CWP-1105-2004	KRISHAN KAUR V/S STATE OF PB. & ORS.
18	CWP-8774-2004	RAM GOPAL GUPTA & ORS. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
19	CWP-18372-2004	SULEKHA V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
20	CWP-6439-2007	VEENA SHARMA V/S STATE OF PB. AND ORS.
21	CWP-76-2006	T.D. KOHLI & B.K.VERMA & ORS. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS.
22	CWP-6395-2007	LIVLEEN KAUR V/S STATE OF PB. AND ORS.
23	CWP-12965-2005	SURJIT SINGH SIDHU V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS.
24	CWP-10315-2007	SAROJ BALA AND ANR. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
25	CWP-23-2012	DEV SAMAJ COLLEGE FOR WOMEN AND ORS. V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.
26	CWP-16166-2011	RK ARYA COLLEGE AND ORS V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS
27	CWP-2668-2015	THE MANAGING COMMITTEE, AKAL DEGREE COLLEGE V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS
28	CWP-27165-2015	AD COLLEGE V/S STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS
29	CWP-22676-2021	MANAGING COMMITTEE GURU NANAK COLLEGE MOGA AND ORS V/S THE EDUCATIONAL TRIBUNAL PUNJAB AND ORS
30	CWP-26356-2023	SDP COLLEGE FOR WOMEN AND ANR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
31	CWP-11995-2024	SWAMI GANGA GIRI JANTA GIRLS COLLEGE AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
32	LPA-1984-2024	STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS V/S DR KANWARJIT SINGH AND OTHERS
33	CWP-6288-2025	GHG GURU HARGOBIND KHALSA COLLEGE, GURUSAR SADHAR, LUDHIANA AND ANOTHER V/S DIRECTOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS (COLLEGES), PUNJAB AND OTHERS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Argued by: Mr. Salil Sagar, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Sankalp Sagar, Advocate and
Mr. Suil Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-4897-2017).

Mr. Pawan Kumar, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. M.S. Vidushi Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-2668-2015)

Mr. Akshay Bhan, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. R.S. Cheema, Advocate,
Mr. Rohit Nagpal, Advocate and
Mr. Abhijeet Rawaley, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-20576-2017).

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate with
Mr. Preet Agroa, Advocate,
Mr. Abhishek Singla, Advocate and
Ms. Tanya Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP-17800-2024).

Mr. Rahul Verma, Advocate and
Mr. Rajinder Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWPs-4897, 4081, 6395, 6439, 10315-2007)

Mr. Shrome Garg, Advocate for
Mr. Rahul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CWPs-12406, 12627, 13913, 14106-2017)

Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-21739-2021)

Mr. Ashish Kushik, Advocate for
Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-28198-2018).

Mr. Vivek Dahiya, Advocate for
Dr. Puneet Kaur Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-22676-2021)

Mr. Arjun Pratap, Advocate with
Ms. Shifali Bahia, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-26356-2023 and CWP-6288-2025)

Dr. Puneet Kaur Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-22676-2021 and CWP-16855-2024)

Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate with
Mr. Harnirmal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-6439-2007)

Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate
for the intervener (in CM-19503-CWP-2024 in CWP-4081-2007)

Mr. Binderjit Singh, Advocate
for private respondents (in CWPs-4081, 6395, 6439-2007).

Mr. Keshor Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. Puneet Jindal, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Rohit Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.4 to 6 (in CWP-26356-2023).

Mr. Binderjit Singh, Advocate
for the respondents (in CWP-4081 and 4897-2007)

Mr. Binderjit Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3 (in LPA-1282-2017)

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Advocate
for respondent No.7.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Advocate
for respondent No.3-P.U. (in CWP-26356-2023)

Mr. Karan Bhandari, Advocate for
Mr. M.K. Dogra, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. Akshay, Advocate
for respondent No.3 (in CWP-11995-2024) and
for respondent No.2 (in CWP-6288-2025)

Mr. A.P.S. Tung, Advocate
for respondents No.3 and 4 (in CWP-12550-2003, CWP-1105 and 18372-2004 and CWP-12965-2005)

Mr. Vikrant Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.6 (in CWP-12550-2003 and CWP-1105-2004)

***

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. Since all the writ petitions involve a common question of law as well as common reliefs have been sought thereins, as such, all the writ petitions are amenable to become decided through a common verdict.

2. For the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from CWP-4897-2017.

3. Through the instant writ petition, the petitioner prays for the hereinafter extracted reliefs:-

> *"Civil Writ Petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of certiorari quashing the Punjab Privately Managed Aided Colleges (Non Payment of Grant in Aid on account of terminal benefits) Act, 2016 (Annexure P-11) as illegal, arbitrary and ultra vires the Constitution of India.*
>
> *An appropriate writ/order, especially of certiorari setting aside the recovery of grant already disbursed qua "leave encashment and gratuity etc" (Annexure P-12) from the members of petitioner federation;*
>
> *An appropriate writ/order including mandamus, declaring that the private aided colleges within the State of Punjab are entitled to receive grant-in-aid qua expenditure towards leave encashment and gratuity, etc.*
>
> *A writ of mandamus directing the respondents to release the arrears of grant-in-aid to private aided colleges qua the expenditure towards leave encashment and gratuity, etc."*

Brief facts of the case

4. The Department of Education, Govt. of Punjab, came out with a Grant-In-Aid scheme (Annexure P-2) to provide financial assistance to the private colleges within the State of Punjab but to the extent of 95% on deficit-expenditure. The said scheme was communicated to Respondent No.2 for its implementation throughout the State of Punjab.

5. Vide letter dated 21.3.1979, the abovementioned Grant-In-Aid Scheme was implemented for granting financial assistance to non-government aided colleges w.e.f., 01.09.1978, thus for those posts which were in existence as on 01.11.1977, and became further reviewed on 01.11.1981/1986 but within the area of State of Punjab qua those apposite

institutions which became affiliated to any of the Universities of the State, including Punjab University, Chandigarh.

6. When some of the employees of some of the privately aided educational institutions in Punjab, faced a delay in the payment of their dues towards their entitlements qua gratuity, leave encashment and Provident Fund, rather from the State and Colleges, thereupon they resorted to filing a petition in this Court. To the said writ petition CWP No.76 of 2006 became assigned. In the said petition, while the privately aided colleges contested the espoused claim on the ground, that the State should first release grant-in-aid qua the claimed dues. The State Government, on the other hand, took a specific stand that the College(s) should initially make the payment towards the said liabilities and thereafter claim the grant-in-aid.

7. The said writ petition was ultimately allowed vide order dated 06.07.2010 (Annexure P-3) with a direction to the Colleges rather to pay the amounts due in the first instance, and thereafter claim reimbursement(s) of the appositely made disbursements, thus under the grant-in-aid scheme. Furthermore, the State Government was directed to reimburse the amount(s) claimed by the Colleges.

8. Subsequently, the Colleges upon becoming aggrieved by the said judgment and order passed in CWP No.8774 of 2004, challenged the same by filing an intra-court appeal bearing LPA No.792 of 2011 and LPA No. 519 of 2011. The said LPAs were dismissed by the Division Bench of this Court, on 06.05.2011 (Annexure P-4) wherebys the order of the learned Single Bench became upheld.

9. The State of Punjab belatedly decided to challenge the decision passed in LPA No.519 of 2011 by filing an SLP before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which was numbered as SLP Nos.10379 and 10380 of 2012. The said SLPs were tagged along with SLP No.13110 of 2008 vide order dated 16.03.2012. Therefore all the matters were ordered to be decided together.

10. After hearing the arguments of the parties, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, disposed of the SLPs vide order dated 26.11.2013 (Annexure P-5) through remanding to this Court for reconsideration, thus the issue appertaining to the apposite liability(ies) to pay the gratuity and leave encashment. While so remanding, for adjudicating the entire issue regarding the liability(ies) to pay the gratuity and leave encashment, the Apex Court also directed, but as an interim measure qua till the writs were decided afresh by this Court, qua thereupto the Colleges were to make the payment(s) in the first instance and subsequently the same were to be reimbursed by the State Government.

11. <u>Even the contempt petition bearing No.COCP-1119-2012 was ultimately disposed of, when the State Government filed a compliance affidavit, whereins, it was informed that the actions towards apposite reimbursement becomes taken by it, through the makings of payments of about one crore to the said college(s). While finally disposing of the said contempt petition, the State Government had given a specific undertaking that such action amounting to defiance of law and respect towards orders of the Court would not happen in the future. The copy of the proceedings in contempt case, wherein, the petitioner was also associated becomes appended herewith as Annexure P-6 to P-8.</u>

12. In order to avoid its liability for payments to the colleges, as appertaining to the deficit qua expenditure towards gratuity and leave encashment, the State chose to file a review petition in the Hon'ble Supreme Court (Annexure P-9) against the order dated 26.11.2013. The Hon'ble Supreme Court rejected the said plea of the State of Punjab by dismissing the review petition on 09.09.2014 (Annexure P-10).

13. With the dismissal of the review petition, the issue in relation to interim liability to reimburse the apposite deficit(s) appertaining qua the expenditure incurred by the private aided colleges towards gratuity and leave encashment, till the issue is resolved by this Court, thus has attained finality wherebys the same becomes binding on the State of Punjab.

14. Subsequently, the State of Punjab, on 07.04.2016 came out, with the The Punjab Privately Managed Aided Colleges (Non-Payment of Grant-in-Aid on Account of Terminal Benefits) Act, 2016 (Annexure P-11) (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act of 2016') wherebys it sought to legislatively, oust thus with retrospective effect, the liability(ies) fastened upon it, through the passing of decision (Annexure P-10), as appertaining towards incidences of "leave encashment and gratuity etc." through excluding (supra) from the definition of "pay and allowances" as encapsulated in the Grant-in-Aid Scheme, 1979. The said was purportedly done to avoid its obligation to pay the apposite arrears to the private aided colleges.

15. As a consequence of the impugned legislation, the State of Punjab has already initiated the process of recovering the grants-in-aid already disbursed to the Privately Managed Aided Colleges, as a result of

various passed Court orders, thus by issuing notices of recovery (Annexure P-12).

16. However, vide order dated 10.03.2017, passed by this Court, the makings of recovery of the gratuity and leave encashment paid to any College, thus pursuant to judicial verdicts, which have attained finality, thus was stayed, order whereof becomes extracted hereinafter.

> *"One of the issue that falls for consideration is whether Section 1(2) red with Section 4 of the impugned Act can be permitted to operate to an extent that the amount of gratuity and leave encashment already released in compliance to the Court judgment can also be recovered thereunder?*
>
> *Notice of motion for 12.09.2017.*
>
> *Meanwhile, recovery of the gratuity and leave encashment paid to a College pursuant to the Court orders which has attained finality, shall remain stayed."*

17. The impugned Act of 2016 becomes extracted hereinafter.

> *"1. (1) This Act may be called the Punjab Privately Managed Aided Colleges (Non-Payment of Grant-in-Aid on Account of Terminal Benefits) Act, 2016.*
>
> *(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force on and with effect from the 21st March, 1979.*
>
> *2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,-*
>
> *(a) "Finance Department" means the Department of Finance of the State of Punjab;*
>
> *(b) "State Government" means the Government of the State of Punjab in the Department of Higher Education;*
>
> *(c) "Terminal Benefits" means the benefits payable at the time of retirement from service or otherwise;*
>
> *(d) "Scheme" means the Grant-in-Aid Scheme issued by the Government vide letter No. 2563-5 Edu.1/79-4316 dated 21.3.1979 as amended or to be amended by the Government from time to time; and*
>
> *(e) "Employees" means the employees (working or retired) of the privately Managed Aided Colleges in the State of Punjab covered under the Scheme.*

3. The leave encashment and gratuity etc. being terminal benefits shall not be covered under the Scheme as expenditure of the State Government and the Government shall not be responsible to compensate any management for expenditure on account of such terminal benefits.

4. Notwithstanding anything contained n any instructions, rule or other law for the time being in force and any order or decision of any Court or of any Tribunal, all the Privately Managed Aided Colleges covered under the scheme shall not be entitled to any grant-in-aid on account of payment of the terminal benefits under the Scheme.

5. No suit and prosecution shall lie against the State Government or any officer or employee of the State Government for anything, which is done or intended to be done in good faith under this Act.

6. No Civil Court shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or proceedings in respect of any matter arising under or connected with this Act."

18. The grant-in-aid scheme becomes extracted hereinafter

"GOVERNMENT OF PUNJAB,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
EDUCATION BRANCH.

To

The Director of Public Instruction (colleges) Punjab.
Memo No. 2563-5 Edu1-79/4316
Dated, Chandigarh, the 21st March, 1979

***Subject**: Grant of financial assistance to the private colleges to the extent of 95% of the deficit for the period 1-9-1978 to 28-2-1979.*

***Ref**: Your memo No. 13/2-79 Grant II (4) dated 3-3-1979 and the Punjab Government Memo No. 2118-5 EDI-79/3793 dated 5-3-1979 on the above subject.*

1. The Governor of Punjab is pleased to accord sanction to the payment of Rs.61, 52,190/- (Rupees sixty one lacs, fifty-two thousand and one hundred and ninety only) to the private affiliated colleges in the state to meet their 95% deficit *pertaining to the period 1-9-78 to 28-2-79. The details of the amount sanctioned under this scheme to each of these colleges is given in Annexure 'I'. The payment of the grant shall be governed by the terms and conditions given in Annexure 'II'. Actual deficit for the period 1-9-1978 to 28-2-1979 may, however, be calculated and intimated with a self contained proposal for additional funds in due course of time.*

2. The expenditure involved will be debitable to the head "277-Education-E-University and other Higher Education (D) Assistance to Non Government Arts colleges (Non Plan) 1978-79". The amount will be drawn by the Assistance Director (Colleges), of your office and disbursed to the colleges through bank draft after observing all the formalities prescribed in this behalf.

3. This issues with the concurrence of the Finance Department conveyed vide their U.O. No.1296-IFD2-79 dated 20-3-1979.

xxx

Annexure-II

Terms and conditions of the financial grant to be given to the Private Colleges on the basis of 95% of the deficit:-

1. The grant shall be available only to a college, which was in existence on 1-9-1978, within the area of the Punjab State and which was affiliated to the Panjab University, Punjabi University or the Guru Nanak Dev University on or before that date. The grant shall be available to such a college is respect of post in existence in the college on 1-11-1977, on the conditions that these posts have been created in accordance with the norms prescribed by the University or the Govt. and incumbents are not being paid salaries out of the students funds.

2. The college must not allow its income from the approved resources to fall below the level of such income during the financial year 1977-78. Income of the college shall include admission fee, tuition fee (Received directly or through *reimbursement), late admission fee, late payment fine, Fines recovered from students, grant in aid received by the college under the UGC Salary scheme or under any other scheme from the Govt. or the UGC for payment and salary and allowances of the teaching and non teaching staff.*

3. The approved item of expenditure shall be as follows:-

i. Pay and allowances of the teaching and non-teaching staff.

ii. Contribution towards the Provident Fund of the eligible employees.

4. Lecturers in colleges who were in position on 20-6-1975 who did not possess, at the time of their initial recruitment, minimum qualifications as prescribed by the University concerned, shall be required to attain these qualification. If they are unable to do so; annual increment shall not be allowed w.e.f. 1-3-1982. Those Lecturers, who were recruited after 20-6-1975, shall also be required to improve their minimum qualifications prescribed by the University within the period of five years, failing which their annual increment will also be stopped till they satisfy this condition.

5. For future, only such candidates shall be appointed to the posts of Lectures and Principals as have the prescribed qualifications. All such appointments shall be made on merit and on the basis of open advertisements. The selection Committee for the post of Lecturer shall consist of:

(a) Chairman Governing Body of the College or his nominee.

(b) A nominee of the Vice-Chancellor who is also an expert in the subject.

(c) Principal of the College.

(d) A representative of the Director of Public Instruction (C), Punjab Chandigarh.

(e) One subject-expert of be detailed by the Director, Public Instruction (Colleges)

No Selection shall be considered valid unless at least one representative of the Director, Public Instruction (Colleges) is present. Recommendations of the selection Committee shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Instruction (C), Punjab.

All appointments of Principals of colleges shall be made by a Selection Committee consisting of the Following:-

a) Chairman, Governing Body of the College.

b) One nominee of the Vice-Chancellor.

c) One person to be appointed by the Chairman of the Governing Body out of a panel of ten persons prepared by the Director of Public Instruction (Colleges), Punjab.

d) Director of Public Instruction (C) or his representative.

The recommendations of the selection Committee shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Instruction (Colleges), Punjab.

6. Ad-hoc appointments to posts on account of leave vacancies may be made by the Principals through the Employment Exchange or open advertisement subject to the condition that the selected candidates have the qualification as prescribed by the UGC. These selections shall be approved by the Director, Public Instruction (Colleges), Punjab.

7. The Period of probation of a teacher shall in no case be more than 24 months. The executive Council or the Governing Body of the college may, for reasons to be recorded, waive the condition of probation.

8. The Teaching staff of the college shall be paid salaries according to the revised UGC pay scales approved by the State Government. The teaching and the non-teaching staff shall be given salaries every month by payees account cheque and no member of the staff. Shall be compelled to pay or refund, directly or indirectly, any part of the salary admissible to him under the rules.

9. The assessment at Rs. 1,300/- in the grade of Rs.700-1600 for lecturers in private colleges shall be made by a committee to be appointed by D.P.I. (C) and this Committee may include a nominee of the University concerned.

10. The fees and funds shall be released in accordance with the rules and instruction issued by University concerned, from time to time. Fee concessions shall be in accordance with the norms laid down by the university.

11. All account-books, attendance registers, time table, (teacher-wise and class wise) the college prospectus and the record connected with appointments, promotions, terminations and abolition or conversion of posts, service books and annual confidential reports shall be maintained as a permanent record. These books shall be open to inspection and audit by any officer authorized by the Department for the purpose.

12. All audit objections shall be removed by the college without any delay.

13. The grant shall not be admissible in respect of employees who are retained in service after 60 years of age.

14. The D.P.L. (C), Punjab has the right to refuse, withhold, suspend, stop, withdraw the grant partially or wholly, if the institution is unable to maintain proper academic standards and discipline, and shall have the right to recover any such grant in case of over-payment or misuse of the grant or non-compliance with instructions issued by the Government from time to time.

15. The Government shall have the right to nominate representative on the Management committee of the college.

16. A new incumbent to the post shall be paid the minimum of the pay of the grade sanctioned for the post. However, an incumbent who was previously working in another college may be paid the salary last drawn by him subject to the condition that such salary was drawn by him in such pay scale admissible to such employees in Government Service.

17. The college shall abide by the provisions of Punjab College (Security of Service) Act, 1974 as amended from time to time and shall comply with all orders and directions issued by the Director Instruction (C) under the provisions of this Act.

18. A certificate shall be furnished by the Principal of the College to which the grant is given that the each of the lecturers for whom the grant has been claimed puts in 40 hours of work in a week. Out of this, he will spend at-least 20 hours in a week on the premises of the colleges for teaching and guidance of students. This would be subject to the provision that a teacher may be detained in the college beyond this limit in the interest of work.

19. No member of the teaching or non-teaching staff shall be allowed pay scales higher than those prescribed by the Government for the corresponding posts in the Government colleges. If higher grades have already been allowed in a college, the differences of salary shall be born by the management concerned.

20. The Principal of the college shall submit to the Director, Public Instruction (C), Punjab, utilization certificate and disbursement certificate duly verified by the Chartered Accountant including the share of the Management before obtaining the next grant under the scheme.

21. The grant is to be utilized only for the period to which it pertains and shall not, in any case, by utilized to clear earlier claims or arrears.

22. The entire staff of the college shall be liable to be put on examination duty including invigilation, setting papers evaluation of answer books that may be assigned to them by the Education Department or by any University within the State of Punjab and the Panjab University Chandigarh.

23. The Government may, from time to time, add, delete or alter any of the terms and conditions without may notice.

24. Failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions may entail termination of the grant wholly or partially."

19. The relevant Section 9-B of The Punjab Affiliated Colleges (Security of Service of Employees), Act 1974 as amended upto 15.02.2008 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act of 1974') becomes extracted hereinafter.

> ***"9-b. Grant of pensionary benefits*** *– The State Government, may grant to the employees appointed against the aided posts such pensionary benefits and on such terms and conditions stoppage of the grant-in-aid."*

20. The learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a judgment passed by Apex Court in case titled as '***Jagdish Prasad Saini and Ors. V. State of Rajasthan & Ors.***' bearing Civil Appeal No.6953 of 2022, relevant paragraph whereof becomes extracted hereinafter.

> *"21. This court had categorically ruled, in Senior Higher Secondary School (supra) that leave encashment is part of salary. In the scheme of the 1993 Rules, the assessment of, and determination of the extent of, aid to be granted to any institution, is provided by Rule 13. What forms part of the approved expenditure that would be the content of aid, is provided by Rule 14. In the present case, the management establishment was recipient of 70% aid, in the form of grant. In these circumstances, the State cannot shrug its responsibility to shoulder its part of the responsibility to pay the appellants the share of leave encashment benefits, and hide behind either Rule 5 (viii) or the undertaking executed by them. The appellants are held entitled to privilege leave entitlement benefits. Such benefit shall be calculated from the date they entered the service of the establishment till the date of their absorption, by the State, in 2016. The State shall pay the benefits due to the extent of 70%, and the balance 30% shall be payable by the management establishment."*

21. He further relied upon a judgment passed by Apex Court in case titled as '***State of T.N. V. M/s. Arooran Sugars Ltd.***', bearing Civil Appeal No.134 of 1980, relevant paragraph whereof becomes extracted hereinafter.

> *"16. The scope of a non-obstante clause and of validating Act has been examined by this Court from time to time. Reference in this connection be made to the judgment in the case of* ***Prithvi Cotton Mills Ltd. v. Broach Borough Municipality, (1969)2 SCC 283*** *where Hidayatullah, C.J. speaking for the Constitution Bench said :*
>
> > *"When a legislature sets out to validate a tax declared by a court to be illegally collected under an ineffective or an invalid law, the cause for ineffectiveness or invalidity must be removed before validation can be said to take place effectively. The most important condition, of course, is that the legislature must possess the power to impose the tax, for if it does not, the action must ever remain ineffective and illegal. Granted legislative competence, it is not sufficient to declare merely that the decision of the court shall not bind for that is tantamount to reversing the decision in exercise of judicial power which the legislature does not possess or exercise. A court's decision must always bind unless the conditions on which it is based are so fundamentally altered that the decision could not have been given in the altered circumstances. Ordinarily, a court holds a tax to be invalidly imposed because the power to tax is wanting or the statute or the rules or both are invalid or do not sufficiently create the jurisdiction. Validation of a tax so declared illegal may be done only if the grounds of illegality or invalidity are capable of being removed and are in fact removed and the tax thus made legal. Sometimes this is done by providing for jurisdiction where jurisdiction had not been properly invested before. Sometimes this is done by re-enacting retrospectively a valid and legal taxing provision and then by fiction making the tax already collected to stand under the re-enacted law. Sometimes the legislature gives its own meaning and interpretation of the law under which the tax was collected and by legislative fiat makes the new meaning binding upon courts. The legislature may follow any one method or all of them and while it does so it may neutralise the effect of the earlier decision of the court which becomes ineffective after the change of the law."*

The same view was reiterated in the cases of ***West Ramnad Electric Distribution Co. Ltd. v. State of Madras, (1963)2 SCR 747; Udai Ram Sharma v. Union of India, (1968)3 SCR 41.; Tirath Ram Rajindra Nath v. State of U.P., (1973)3 SCC 585.; Krishna Chandra Gangopadhyaya v. Union of India, (1975)2 SCC 302; Hindustan Gum and Chemicals Ltd. v. State of Haryana, (1985)4 SCC 124; Utkal Contractors and Joinery (P) Ltd. v. State of Orissa, 1987 Supp SCC 751 : D. Cawasjj and Co. v. State of Mysore, 1984 Supp SCC 490*** *and* ***Bhubaneshwar Singh v. Union of India, (1994 6 SCC 77).*** *It is open to the legislature to remove the defect pointed out by the Court or to amend the definition or any other provision of the Act in question retrospectively. In this process it cannot be said that there has been an encroachment by the legislature over the power of the judiciary. A court's directive must always bind unless the conditions on which it is based are so fundamentally altered that under altered circumstances such decisions could not have been given. This will include removal of the defect in a statute pointed out in the judgment in question, as well as alteration or substitution of provisions of the enactment on which such judgment is based, with retrospective effect. This is what has happened in the present case. The judgment of the High Court in Writ Petition No.1464/74, dated 8-10-1976 was solely based on the amendments which had been introduced by Act 7 of 1974. If those amendments so introduced have been effected by Act 25 of 1978 with retrospective effect saying, that it shall be deemed that no such amendment had ever been introduced in the principal Act, then full effect has to be given to the provisions of later Act unless they are held to be ultra vires or unconstitutional."*

22. The relevant table regarding fee/fund charges of undergraduate classes (I, II & III) of the Affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab for the Session 2023-24, also becomes extracted hereinafter.

Fee/Fund charges of Undergrduate Classes (I, II & III) of the Affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab for the Session 2023-24				
Sr. No.	Particulars	B.A.	B.Com.	B.Sc.
1	Admission Fee	170	170	170
2	Tuition Fee	790	790	790
3	Retirement Benefit Fund	2412	2412	2412
4	Library Development Fund	354	354	354
5	Student Scholarship Fund (Meritorious cum Mean Students)	260	260	260

6	College Sports Fund	425	425	425
7	Library Security (Refundable)	295	295	295
8	College Youth Welfare Fund	165	165	165
9	Prize distribution Functions	153	153	153
10	Seminar/Club/Societies	153	153	153
11	College News & Annual Report	82	82	82
12	Identity/Library Card	82	82	82
13	Magazine Charges	224	224	224
14	Medical Charges	153	153	153
15	Environment Education Fees	331	331	331
16	Student Aid Fund (Poor & Needy)	425	425	425
17	Amalgamated Fund	2116	2116	2116
18	Lab Charges Rs.70/- per month per Practical subject	-	-	-
B	Sub-Total	8590	8590	8590
C	University Charges Annexure V (B)	583	583	583
D	College Running and Maintenance charges	4647	16034	6385
	Grand Total (B+C+D)	13820	25207	15558
	xxx			

23. The relevant table regarding fee/fund charges of undergraduate classes (I, II & III) of the Affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab for the Session 2013-14, becomes extracted hereinafter.

Sr. No.	Particulars	B.A.	B.Com.	B.Sc.
1	Admission Fee	165	165	165
2	Tuition Fee	756	756	756
3	Retirement Benefits Fund	1500	1500	1500
4	Library Development Fund	250	250	250
5	Student Scholarship Fund (Meritorious Students)	180	180	180
6	College Sports Fund	300	300	300
7	Library Security (Refundable)	210	210	210
8	College Youth Welfare Fund	110	110	110
9	Prize distribution Function	100	100	100

10	Seminar/Club/Societies	100	100	100
11	College News & Annual Report	50	50	50
12	Identity/Library Card	50	50	50
13	Magazine Charges	150	150	150
14	Medical Charges	100	100	100
15	Environment Education Fee Rs.20/- p.m.	240	240	240
16	Student Aid Fund (Poor & Needy) Rs.125/- p.m.	300	300	300
17	Amalgamated Fund Rs. 125/- p.m.	1500	1500	1500
18	Lab Charges Rs.100/- p.m.	-	-	1200
B	Sub-Total (A)	6061	6061	7261
C	University Charges (B)	467	467	467
D	College Running and Maintenance charges (C)	3472	8472	3472
	Grand Total (B+C+D)	10000	15000	11200

Submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner

24. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits, that leave encashment being a part of salary, thus in terms of the appointments of the private respondents, therefore, the apposite liability in respect thereof, is to be encumbered upon the State. A perusal of the Grant-in-aid scheme, would show, that the Government had principally agreed to extend, the benefit of 95% of the appositely incurred deficit expenditure by the college(s), thus to the colleges concerned.

25. He further submits, that the action of State in enacting the Act of 2016 but is contrary to the principles of legitimate expectation, promissory estoppel, more so, it is without any rational basis and nor any rationale objective is to be therebys achieved, except that the State is merely trying to evade its liability of reimbursing to the respective management/employees of the petitioners, rather those amount(s) which are payable to the petitioners.

The said enactment takes away the vested rights already created through concluded contracts of appointment, whereins, envisagings supportive of the writ claim became laid, thus in view of grant-in-aid scheme.

26. He further submits, that the stand of the respondent-State, that since grant-in-aid scheme, 1979 only covers "pay and allowances", thus the obligation of the State Government to provide financial aid qua the espoused "terminal benefits", did not at all arise, under the said Scheme, wherebys the same cannot be sustained. However, he submits that therebys the State is only trying to avoid its obligation to pay arrears of grant-in-aid in respect of expenditures relating to the above said specific heads, as such, the State has indirectly done what it could not have directly done, inasmuch as,

I) With the writ petition being CWP-76-2006 becoming allowed vide order dated 06.07.2010 (Annexure P-3) with a direction to the Colleges, rather to pay the amounts due in the first instance, and thereafter claim reimbursement(s) of the appositely made disbursements, thus under the grant-in-aid scheme. Furthermore, with the State Government being directed to reimburse the amounts claimed by the Colleges to the latter.

II) Since the Colleges' upon becoming aggrieved by the said judgment and order passed in CWP No.8774 of 2004, thus challenging the same by filing intra-court appeals bearing LPA No.792 of 2011 and LPA No.519 of 2011. However, since the said LPAs becoming dismissed by the Division Bench of this Court, on 06.05.2011 (Annexure P-4) wherebys the order of the learned Single Bench became upheld.

III) Since the State of Punjab also challenged the decision passed in LPA No.519 of 2011 by filing an SLP before the Apex Court, which was respectively numbered as SLP No.10379 and SLP No.10380 of 2012. The said SLPs were tagged along with SLP No.13110 of 2008 vide order dated 16.03.2012. Therefore all the matters were ordered to be decided together.

IV) After hearing the arguments of the parties, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, disposed of the SLPs vide order dated 26.11.2013 (Annexure P-5), through remanding to this Court for reconsideration, thus the issue appertaining to the apposite liability(ies) to pay gratuity and leave encashment. Since while remanding, for adjudicating the entire issue regarding the liability(ies) to pay the gratuity and leave encashment, the Apex Court also directed, but as an interim measure qua till the writs were decided afresh by this Court, qua thereupto the Colleges were to make the apposite payments in the first instance and subsequently the same were to be reimbursed by the State Government.

V) Since the contempt petition bearing No.COCP-1119-2012 was ultimately disposed of, when the State Government filed a compliance affidavit, whereins, it was informed that the actions towards apposite reimbursement becoming taken by it, through the makings of payments of about one crore to the said college(s). Moreover while finally disposing of the said contempt petition, the State Government had given a specific undertaking that such action amounting to defiance of law and respect towards orders of the Court would not happen in the future.

VI) Therefores, but ex facie in order to avoid its liability for payments to the colleges, as appertaining to the deficit qua expenditure towards gratuity and leave encashment, the State also filed a review petition (Annexure P-9) against the order dated 26.11.2013 (Annexure P-5) in the Apex Court. However, since the Apex Court rejected the said plea of the State of Punjab by dismissing the review petition on 09.09.2014 (Annexure P-10).

Inferences of this Court

27. Imperatively all (supra) have telling effectivity(ies) vis-a-vis the espoused claim of the petitioner-colleges whereupons all mandate(s) as enclosed therein, thus were to be obeyed.

28. In the instant case, the judgment passed by the Apex Court in ***Jagdish Prasad Saini's case (supra)***, wherebys the issue relating to liability of the State to reimburse, the deficit qua expenditure incurred by private aided colleges, towards gratuity and leave encashment, became settled.

29. Moreover, the makings of (supra) interim measures in the remanded cases, when acquired binding and conclusive effectivity, till the makings of a final decision, upon the (supra) remanded lis. Since though in the first instance the colleges' became enjoined to, discharge the relevant liabilities whereafters apposite claims for reimbursement, thus under the grant-in-aid scheme in respect thereof, were to be laid by the colleges before

State Governments. In addition, when the Apex Court after making the said interim directions, had remanded the lis to this Court. As such despite the lis being subjudice, yet to undo the effect of the (supra) direction besides to preclude this Court from making a final decision over the subjudice writ petition, thus the Act of 2016 has been passed.

30. This Court after disposing of the apposite contempt petition, thus pursuant to an undertaking being made by the State Government, that no further action shall be taken to make defiance of verdicts passed by this Court, yet the instant legislation has been passed.

31. Therefore, on the said premise besides for the further reasons, to be assigned hereinafter, the instantly passed legislation thus undoes, the impact of all (supra), besides ill precludes this Court from passing a final decision on the writ petition which became remanded to this Court for a re-decision being made thereons, but yet maintaining and affirming the interim directions (supra).

32. The reason for stating so emanates from the factum, that though judicial verdicts are binding upon the legislature, besides though the legislature has the competence to undo the effect of any judgment. However, if any judicial verdict rests, the same on such conditions or on those premises or basis' whereby the same are so fundamentally altered, wherebys the decision could not have been given in the altered circumstances. Therefore, the legislature, if otherwise, did have the power to legislate or had the apposite legislative competence, yet care was required to be undertaken, that in the said endeavour of purportedly undoing the effectivity of the (supra) interim directions, and, also purportedly precluding this Court from

deciding the writ petition on merits, thus there being an enjoined necessity qua the passing of a final judicial verdict, on the subjudice writ petitions, whereupons that the thereins noticed defects, rather were amenable for becoming removed through the passing of a competent legislation. Reiteratedly, the said could be done either through an appropriate amendment being effected to the relevant impugned provisions or as in the instant case the definition of "terminal benefits" if otherwise not arbitrary, thus becoming altered, so as to envisage thereins qua leave encashment and gratuity becoming amenable to become withheld from the respondents concerned.

33. The relevant principles of law in the said regard, become encapsulated in a judgment passed by the Apex Court in ***Jagdish Prasad Saini's case (supra)***', relevant paragraph whereof becomes re-extracted hereinafter.

> *"21. This court had categorically ruled, in Senior Higher Secondary School (supra) that leave encashment is part of salary. In the scheme of the 1993 Rules, the assessment of, and determination of the extent of, aid to be granted to any institution, is provided by Rule 13. What forms part of the approved expenditure that would be the content of aid, is provided by Rule 14. In the present case, the management establishment was recipient of 70% aid, in the form of grant. In these circumstances, the State cannot shrug its responsibility to shoulder its part of the responsibility to pay the appellants the share of leave encashment benefits, and hide behind either Rule 5 (viii) or the undertaking executed by them. The appellants are held entitled to privilege leave entitlement benefits. Such benefit shall be calculated from the date they entered the service of the establishment till the date of their absorption, by the State, in 2016. The State shall pay the benefits due to the extent of*

70%, and the balance 30% shall be payable by the management establishment."

34. The relevant principles of law in the said regard become also encapsulated in a judgment passed by the Apex Court in ***M/s. Arooran Sugars Ltd.'s case (supra)***', relevant paragraph whereof becomes re-extracted hereinafter.

> *"16. The scope of a non-obstante clause and of validating Act has been examined by this Court from time to time. Reference in this connection be made to the judgment in the case of* ***Prithvi Cotton Mills Ltd. v. Broach Borough Municipality, (1969)2 SCC 283*** *where Hidayatullah, C.J. speaking for the Constitution Bench said :*
>
> > *"When a legislature sets out to validate a tax declared by a court to be illegally collected under an ineffective or an invalid law, the cause for ineffectiveness or invalidity must be removed before validation can be said to take place effectively. The most important condition, of course, is that the legislature must possess the power to impose the tax, for if it does not, the action must ever remain ineffective and illegal. Granted legislative competence, it is not sufficient to declare merely that the decision of the court shall not bind for that is tantamount to reversing the decision in exercise of judicial power which the legislature does not possess or exercise. A court's decision must always bind unless the conditions on which it is based are so fundamentally altered that the decision could not have been given in the altered circumstances. Ordinarily, a court holds a tax to be invalidly imposed because the power to tax is wanting or the statute or the rules or both are invalid or do not sufficiently create the jurisdiction. Validation of a tax so declared illegal may be done only if the grounds of illegality or invalidity are capable of being removed and are in fact removed and the tax thus made legal. Sometimes this is done by providing for jurisdiction where jurisdiction had not been properly invested before. Sometimes this is done by re-enacting retrospectively a valid and legal taxing provision and then by fiction making the tax already collected to stand under the re-enacted law. Sometimes the*

> *legislature gives its own meaning and interpretation of the law under which the tax was collected and by legislative fiat makes the new meaning binding upon courts. The legislature may follow any one method or all of them and while it does so it may neutralise the effect of the earlier decision of the court which becomes ineffective after the change of the law."*

The same view was reiterated in the cases of ***West Ramnad Electric Distribution Co. Ltd. v. State of Madras, (1963)2 SCR 747; Udai Ram Sharma v. Union of India, (1968)3 SCR 41.; Tirath Ram Rajindra Nath v. State of U.P., (1973)3 SCC 585.; Krishna Chandra Gangopadhyaya v. Union of India, (1975)2 SCC 302; Hindustan Gum and Chemicals Ltd. v. State of Haryana, (1985)4 SCC 124; Utkal Contractors and Joinery (P) Ltd. v. State of Orissa, 1987 Supp SCC 751 : D. Cawasjj and Co. v. State of Mysore, 1984 Supp SCC 490*** *and* ***Bhubaneshwar Singh v. Union of India, (1994 6 SCC 77).*** *It is open to the legislature to remove the defect pointed out by the Court or to amend the definition or any other provision of the Act in question retrospectively. In this process it cannot be said that there has been an encroachment by the legislature over the power of the judiciary. A court's directive must always bind unless the conditions on which it is based are so fundamentally altered that under altered circumstances such decisions could not have been given. This will include removal of the defect in a statute pointed out in the judgment in question, as well as alteration or substitution of provisions of the enactment on which such judgment is based, with retrospective effect. This is what has happened in the present case. The judgment of the High Court in Writ Petition No.1464/74, dated 8-10-1976 was solely based on the amendments which had been introduced by Act 7 of 1974. If those amendments so introduced have been effected by Act 25 of 1978 with retrospective effect saying, that it shall be deemed that no such amendment had ever been introduced in the principal Act, then full effect has to be given to the provisions of later Act unless they are held to be ultra vires or unconstitutional."*

35. Now, in the present case there was ex facie no passing(s) of any final decision, on the subjudice writ petition(s), which became remanded to this Court for a re-decision being made thereons. Therefore, without any final decision becoming made in the yet subjudice writ petitions, rather in the legislature passing a law, to undo the effect of the binding and effective interim directions (supra), thus makes the presently passed legislation to face the ire of the (supra) expostulation(s) of law. Furthermore, when contempt petition bearing No.COCP-1119-2012, was closed with an undertaking, that no subsequent defiance shall be made to the Court orders, yet in the garb of the present legislation, the effect of all (supra) has been undone, that too without a final decision being passed on the subjudice petition.

36. Therefore, when the premise of the (supra) expostulations of law wherebys the effective clout of any judgment passed by the Courts of law can be undone, is that, though it is competent for the legislature, to undo any judgment, but despite no judgment becoming passed over the subjudice writ petitions, but yet the legislature rather choosing to undo the effectivity of the interim measures, besides thereby precluding this Court from passing a verdict, on the subjudice writ petition.

37. Therefore, in the present factual scenario, the (supra) expostulations of law are not satisfied, wherebys the instant exercisings of legislative powers by the legislature, does prima facie appear to be omnibusly ill thought, wherebys no validity can be assigned theretos.

38. Moreover, the further effect of the above inference, is that, the snatchings therebys of rights acquired under (supra) binding interim directions, thus through making, the present legislation to be retrospective,

becomes also ingrained with lack of application of mind, besides is outside the contours of the (supra) expostulation of law.

39. Now assumingly, the said power covers a situation qua amendments being made vis-a-vis the apposite definition or qua any other provision of the Act and that too retrospectively. However, the present impugned legislation wherebys, the definition of "gratuity and leave encashment" as has been changed, as to make the (supra) to fall within the definition of "terminal benefits", wherebys there are denial(s) to the colleges concerned, to after initially making releases thereof, to the employees concerned, thus seek in terms of the interim directions (supra), reimbursement thereofs from the State Government. Naturally therebys the (supra) interim directions have been rendered impermissibly redundant.

40. Reiteratedly since this Court was seized with the relevant lis', thus covering the (supra) issues, therebys the legislature may have awaited the passing of a final decision by this Court, on the subjudice writ petition, than proceeding to, in a post haste manner and through total non application of mind rather changing the definition of "gratuity and leave encashment" so as to make the (supra) to become covered within the domain of "terminal benefits, so that ultimately, there is denial of the espoused benefits to the employees.

41. Therefore, the Act of 2016 thus invalidating the rules of Grants-In-Aid Scheme of colleges, whereby the colleges become disabled to after initially releasing their proportion towards gratuity and leave encashment, thus seek reimbursements thereofs from the State Government, rather is such, a fundamental alteration, to the apposite definition, which cannot

withstand the scrutiny of the Constitutional parameters, thus relating to reasonableness and non-arbitrariness, as substantive rights, contrary to terms and conditions of the appointment letters rather have also been therebys untenably snatched.

42. Conspicuously when in the appointment letter, salary along with dearness allowance on Punjab Government rates, has been endowed to the employees, besides when it has also been stated thereins, that their service conditions would be regulated by the charter in the said regard becoming laid by the Punjabi University, Patiala. Moreover, though liability(ies) towards gratuity is payable on superannuation, but since it is inextricably entwined with the incidence of service, therefore, to solitarily encumber liability qua thereof upon the private aided colleges rather would be extremely harsh and disproportionate to the employees.

43. Reiteratedly, in the said manner, the State Government has also breached the (supra) undertaking given by it, in the contempt petition (supra), wherebys it undertook that such action amounting to defiance of law and respect towards orders of the Court rather would not happen in future.

44. Even on the merits of the instant writ petitions (supra) since this Court has invalidated the present impugned legislation wherebys within the definition of “terminal benefits”, thus becomes covered “leave encashment and gratuity etc.”, whereas, liability towards discharging the (supra) incidences in terms of grants-in-aid, rather becoming initially encumbered, upon the colleges, whereafters the aided colleges are to seek reimbursement thereofs from the State Government. Consequently, the effect of the (supra) is that, when even the appointment letters (in CWP-12550-2003) manifest

the hereinafter extracted conditions which are in consonance with the grants-in-aid scheme. Resultantly, the colleges are directed to initially release their proportion in respect thereof to the employees whereafters they may choose to claim reimbursements thereof from the State Government.

> *"Your appointment takes effect from Ist August, 1974 (1.8.1974) on which date you will join duty.*
> *You will be on probation for one year from the date of joining.*
> *You will be paid a salary of Rs.300/- per month in the grade of 300-25-600. In addition, you will get dearness allowance and interim relief on Punjab Government rates.*
> *Your services will be governed by service and conduct rules laid down by the Punjabi University, Patiala for teachers working in non-government colleges admitted to the privileges of the University."*

45. In consequence, the instant writ petitions are allowed. The impugned Act of 2016 i.e. the Punjab Privately Managed Aided Colleges (Non Payment of Grant in Aid on account of terminal benefits) Act, 2016, is quashed and set aside, being illegal, arbitrary and ultra vires the Constitutional provisions relating to non discriminatoriness and reasonableness.

46. However, it is clarified that the Colleges are directed to maintain proper auditings of their funds. Only after the said auditings being promptly verified by an auditor to be appointed by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, that the claims towards apposite reimbursements, be released to the colleges concerned, thus by the State Government.

CWP-4081-2007, CWP-12550-2003, CWP-1105-2004, CWP-8774-2004, CWP-18372-2004, CWP-6439-2007, CWP-76-2006, CWP-6395-2007, CWP-12965-2005, CWP-10315-2007, CWP-23-2012 & CWP-16166-2011

47. So far as the remanded cases are concerned, bearing in mind the (supra) observations, it is ordered that the Colleges shall pay the amounts due in the first instance, and thereafter claim reimbursement(s) of the apposite disbursements, thus under the grant-in-aid scheme. It is further directed that the State Government shall reimburse the amount claimed by the Colleges on or before the next academic session but subject to makings of prompt auditings of the accounts maintained by the colleges concerned.

LPA-1984-2024

48. Since the issue involved in the instant LPA has been decided in the connected writ petitions (supra), hence the instant LPA is disposed of in the same terms.

49. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand, disposed of.

50. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file(s) of other connected case(s).

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

25.03.2025 **(VIKAS SURI)**
Ithlesh **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No