



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

206

LPA-914-2016(O&M)

Date of Decision : **September 24, 2025**

SATVIR SINGH

.....Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present : Mr. Tara Chand Saini, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. Sustaining the order of the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana Forest Department dated 27.05.1996, whereby claim of the appellant for promotion on the post of Senior Scale Stenographer w.e.f. 27.09.1984 to 03.06.1990 has been rejected, the appellant's writ came to be rejected by the learned Single Judge. Aggrieved by it, the petitioner is before us in this appeal.

2. The substantive appointment of appellant was on the post of Clerk. A communication was sent by the Additional Chief Conservator of Forests, Social Forestry Project, Haryana, Panchkula on 28.08.1984 requiring interested Clerks knowing Shorthand to apply for Stenographer in the Social Forestry Project on temporary/adhoc basis. This communication made it explicit that the appointment was purely temporary, on adhoc basis, for six months or till the arrival of candidate from the Selection Board, whichever is

earlier. Pursuant to such communication circulated by the department, the appellant applied and was appointed on adhoc basis as Stenographer on 27.09.1984. He continued to work in such capacity. By a subsequent order of 09.09.1985, the appellant's promotion was made temporary w.e.f. 27.07.1984. It transpires that regularly selected candidates from the Board joined in 1987 and 1988 itself. It is thereafter that in 1990 regular promotion was offered to the appellant on substantive post.

3. It transpires that the writ petition came to be filed in 1995 by the appellant claiming regular promotion from 27.09.1984 to 03.06.1990. Pursuant to the directions issued by this Court, the claim of the appellant has been examined by the competent authority and rejected vide order impugned dated 27.05.1996. It has been observed that the initial appointment of appellant itself was on adhoc/temporary basis. The appellant had joined pursuant to such order and never questioned his status as a promoted Stenographer on temporary/adhoc basis. It has also been noticed that the substantive promotion has been granted to the appellant in 1990. Since regular promotion was never offered to the appellant and he had otherwise not challenged his adhoc continuance on the promotional post as Stenographer from 1984 to 1990, as such the rejection of his claim by the authorities has been found valid by the learned Single Judge.

4. Though various submissions are advanced but no illegality in the order of the learned Single Judge could be shown by the learned counsel for the appellant. It remains undisputed that between 1984 to 1990 the continuance of appellant was on adhoc/temporary basis. The appointment order itself made it clear that such appointment was to continue on

adhoc/temporary basis for a period of six months or till a regular selected candidates joined. Various selected candidates otherwise joined in 1987 and 1988. In such circumstances, the appellant could not have claimed regular promotion between 1984 to 1990. We find no good ground to interfere in the order of the learned Single Judge.

5. In that view of the matter, the present Letters Patent Appeal is dismissed.

6. All pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

September 24, 2025

ajaysharma

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No