



CWP-5246-2017

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

205

CWP-5246-2017 (O & M)  
Date of decision: 21.01.2025

Pawan Kumar Singla

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Dhiraj Chawla, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer made in the present petition is for directing the respondents to restore the date of promotion that was granted on 24.11.1998, which was subsequently modified to be effective from 19.03.1990.

2. The petitioner, initially appointed as a clerk in the Punjab Education Department vide order dated 08.08.1983, later joined Punjab Civil Secretariat on 04.02.1985 on the same post, was subsequently promoted to the position of Assistant on 24.11.1988 and granted seniority. However, in the tentative seniority list issued on 28.07.2009, his promotion date was revised to 04.02.1990, based on the premise that his prior experience could not be counted also stipulating that the service rendered between 24.11.1988 and 04.02.1990 be considered as ad hoc. In



CWP-5246-2017

this regard reliance was placed on the judgments in CWP-16707-2010 titled as **Faqir Singh vs State Of Punjab and others** decided on 24.08.10, **Suresh Kumar vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP-14849-2010, decided on 15.09.2011 and **Sec., Eng. Department, U.T. Adm., Chandigarh vs. Vipin Gupta and another**, CWP-12679-2010 decided on 25.10.2010.

3. The aforesaid facts having been brought out, during the course of hearing, learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the respondents would not be averse to have a relook at the matter and decide afresh within a period of 6 months, which this Court has no reason to believe the authorities would not address in a just, fair and reasonable manner.

4. The aforesaid satisfies the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. The matter stands disposed of accordingly and if the petitioner is found entitled, grant the benefit forthwith. Needless to say, if the orders are adverse to his interest, the same may be passed after granting opportunity of hearing to him and shall contain reasons, whereupon he shall be free to seek legal redress thereupon.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

21.01.2025

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No