

CWP-6259-2017
CWP-6337-2017

1

2025:PHHC:089843



206+2

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

CWP-6259-2017

Date of Decision: 22.07.2025

JAI KARAN

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

..... Respondents

2)

CWP-6337-2017 (O&M)

RISH PAL

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order CWP-6259-2017 and CWP-6337-2017 are disposed of since issues involved in the above captioned petitions and prayer sought are common. With the consent of parties and for the sake of brevity, facts are borrowed from CWP-6259-2017.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 22.02.2017 (Annexure P-2) whereby he was retired at the age of 55 years.

3. Prime ground to assail order of retirement is challenge to



adverse remarks recorded in the ACR for the period from 2009 to 2010. The petitioner has preferred **CWP-7974-2014** titled as '**JAI KARAN VERSUS STATE OF HARYANA & ORS**' seeking setting aside of adverse remarks recorded in the ACR for the period from 2009 to 2010. The said petition has been dismissed vide even dated order. The foundation of challenge to impugned order was challenge to adverse remarks recorded in the ACR. Petition assailing adverse remarks stands dismissed, thus, there seems no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

There is another aspect of the matter. The petitioner was made to retire at the age of 55 years vide order dated 22.02.2017 (Annexure P-2). A period of more than 8 years has passed away. In the absence of impugned order, the petitioner was entitled to serve for three more years. The petitioner was working on a pensionable post. He must have received pension for the period from 2017 to 2020. He has not worked during 2017 to 2020, however, has received pension which might be 50% of last drawn salary. In such circumstance, no interference is warranted.

- 4. Dismissed.
- 5. Pending misc. application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

22.07.2025
Ali

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