



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

Date of decision: 03.09.2025

1. C.W.P. No. 24841 of 2025

Om Parkash

.... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

2. C.W.P. No. 26090 of 2025

Paras Ram

.... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Tahaf Bains, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J (Oral)

1. Both these writ petitions are amenable to being decided through a common verdict on account of their encompassing a similar issue for adjudication. For the sake of convenience and brevity, the facts are being extracted from CWP-24841 of 2025.

2. The petitioner approached this Court for issuance of direction upon the respondent to count the work-charge service rendered by him, for the purpose of qualifying service as pension, to re-calculate the pension, and to release the higher pension along with arrears and interest, especially in view of the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.1996 of 2016, titled **Balbir singh (since deceased) through his L.Rs vs. Bakhra Beas Management Board and others**, which was decided on 18.09.2024.



3. It is the case of the petitioner that he was appointed and retired as Weldar in the Department of Irrigation/Water Resources, Punjab. Initially, he was appointed on daily wage/work charge basis, and thereafter his services were regularized. The petitioner put in more than 12 years of regular service, and therefore, in view of the terms of the regularization, he is entitled for the period of work-charge service rendered by him to be counted for the purpose of qualifying service for pension.

4. It would be apposite to record here that the claim of the petitioner in C.W.P. No. 26090 of 2025, has already been considered by the authority concerned, however, no action has been taken till date.

5. On an advance notice, Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of the respondent-BBMB, and without joining the issue of entitlement of the petitioner at this stage, he submits that the LPA upon which the petitioner depends his case, is already challenged by the BBMB by filing Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 18714 of 2025, which is now pending consideration for 19.09.2025. He further submits that the claim of the petitioner cannot be considered by the BBMB till the matter is finally decided by Hon'ble the Supreme Court.

6. In view of the pendency of the matter before Hon'ble the Supreme Court, this Court refrains itself from passing any mandamus. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to approach this Court after decision of the SLP (supra), if cause of action still survives.

7. **Disposed of** accordingly.

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

03.09.2025
deepak

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