



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SR. NO.118

CWP-19944-2025 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION:25.08.2025

GURVINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

...PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S. SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. Nitesh Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. APS Maan, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

N.S. SHEKHAWAT, J.

CM-12128-2025

Application is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

1. The petitioners have filed the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to issue appropriate directions to the official respondents to grant regular salaries along with arrears and interest from the date when their services were regularised, i.e. w.e.f. 01.04.2012, instead of the date when the letters regarding regularisation were issued in their favour.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that even though the prayer has been made to grant regular salaries with effect from the date of realisation along with arrears of interest, however, he shall restrict his claim only to grant the notional benefits and the petitioners shall not claim any arrears. He further submits that the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by judgment dated 04.10.2013 (Annexure P-5) passed by a Co-ordinate Bench in CWP-21750-2012 titled as '**Jeewan Jyoti and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**', wherein the similar relief has been given and against the said judgment, LPA No.56 of 2014 has also been dismissed. Learned counsel has also relied on a judgment of this

Court rendered in CWP-9221-2014 titled as '**Prabhjot Singh and others Vs State of Punjab and another**' (Annexure P-9). Learned counsel also submits that the directions may be issued to respondent No.2 to decide the case of the petitioners in a time bound manner, in the light of the observations made by this Court in the above referred judgments.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of Court, Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, while Mr. APS Maan, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has raised no serious objection to the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and assured this Court that the claim of the petitioners shall be considered in the light of the above-said judgments passed by this Court.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file minutely.

7. There is no dispute that the desired benefit has been given to similarly situated employees, who were the petitioners in **Jeewan Jyoti's** case (supra) and in **Prabhjot Singh's** case (supra), the petitioners will also be granted the said benefit, if found entitled to.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case as noted above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the case of the petitioners in the light of the observations made in the judgments (Annexures P-5 & P-9) passed by this Court within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

25.08.2025
mks

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES / NO
Whether Reportable: YES / NO