



115+119

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

1)

CWP-27351-2025

Date of decision: 15.09.2025

G. Ramesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

2)

CWP-27410-2025

Gurdev Singh and others

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gauravjit Singh Patwalia, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This common order shall dispose of the aforementioned civil writ petitions as they arise from a similar factual matrix. However, for the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from CWP-27351-2025.
2. The present civil writ petition(s) has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to revise the pay scale of the petitioner(s) w.e.f. 01.01.2006 in view of the recommendations of the 5th Pay Commission and further to also pay the arrears to the petitioner(s).



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) *inter alia* contends that the petitioner(s) was appointed as a Driver on 07.04.1979 in the respondent-Corporation and retired as a Vehicle Supervisor on 29.02.2008 as discernible from Annexure P-2. The Board of Directors and the respondent-Corporation vide resolution dated 07.11.2006 adopted the Punjab Government notification dated 01.06.2004. The petitioner(s)' pay was fixed accordingly vide office order dated 26.12.2006 (Annexure P-4). The Government of Punjab further notified the Punjab Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2009 on 27.05.2009 (Annexure P-9) and made it effective retrospectively with effect from 01.01.2006. Further, the Board of Directors of the respondent-Corporation in its meeting held on 30.08.2011 (Annexure P-10) approved the revision of pay scales in principle and referred the matter to the Finance Department. However, vide letter dated 21.01.2016, the Finance Department has expressed its inability to provide funds for the arrears of the revised pay. The petitioner filed CWP No.25396 of 2019 which was disposed of on 11.09.2019 (Annexure P-11) with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the petitioners' notice dated 23.04.2019 by passing a speaking order within a period of three months. In compliance thereof, the respondent-Corporation rejected the claim of the petitioner(s) by issuing impugned office order dated 17.07.2020. He placed reliance upon the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Union of India and others Vs. Tarsem Singh' 2008 SCC OnLine SC 1235.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner(s) and after perusing the record of the case, the claim of the petitioner(s) crystallised in the year 2016 and he submitted a notice on 11.09.2019 which was decided in terms of the directions issued by this Court in the aforementioned writ petition. The



speaking order was passed on 17.07.2020. The petitioner remained indolent and kept sitting over his rights. The reliance of the petitioner(s) on ***Tarsem Singh's case (supra)*** is totally misconceived. The respondent therein was declared invalidated from Army Service on 13.11.1983 and he approached the High Court in the year 1999 for the grant of disability pension. The facts are distinguishable as denial of pension cannot be equated with revision of pay scale in any manner.

5. It is trite law that the delay in approaching this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India may be condoned if sufficient cause is indicated or a reasonable explanation is provided for the same. However, the facts of the matter at hand indicate otherwise. Learned counsel petitioner has failed to specify any compelling or extenuating circumstance which prevented them from approaching this Court for such a long time. Reference in this regard may be made to the judgment rendered by a three-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Chairman/Managing Director, U.P. Power Corporation Limited and Others vs. Ram Gopal (2021) 13 SCC 225***, wherein, the following was held:

“16. Whilst it is true that limitation does not strictly apply to proceedings under Articles 32 or 226 of the Constitution of India, nevertheless, such rights cannot be enforced after an unreasonable lapse of time. Consideration of unexplained delays and inordinate laches would always be relevant in writ actions, and writ courts naturally ought to be reluctant in exercising their discretionary jurisdiction to protect those who have slept over wrongs and allowed illegalities to fester. Fence-sitters cannot be allowed to barge into Courts and cry for their rights at their convenience, and vigilant citizens ought not to be treated alike with mere opportunists. On multiple occasions, it has been restated that there are implicit limitations of time within which writ remedies can be enforced. In *SS Balu v. State of Kerala*, this Court observed thus:



“17. It is also well settled principle of law that "delay defeats equity". It is now a trite law that where the writ petitioner approaches the High Court after a long delay, reliefs prayed for may be denied to them on the ground of delay and laches irrespective of the fact that they are similarly situated to the other candidates who obtain the benefit of the judgment.”” (emphasis added)

6. Further, in *Mrinmoy Maity vs. Chhanda Koley and others* 2024 *AIR SC 2717*, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has categorically observed that the High Courts must factor in the delay, while exercising its discretionary powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It was further opined that undue and unexplained delay may be reason enough to dismiss a petition as indolent litigants ought not to be encouraged by writ Courts.

7. In *State of Uttaranchal v. Shiv Charan Singh Bhandari*, (2013) 12 *SCC 179*, while considering the issue regarding delay and laches and referring to earlier judgments on the issue, a Two-Judge Bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court opined that repeated representations made will not keep the issues alive. A stale or a dead issue/dispute cannot be got revived even if such a representation has either been decided by the authority or got decided by getting a direction from the court as the issue regarding delay and laches is to be decided with reference to original cause of action and not with reference to any such order passed. Delay and laches on the part of a government servant may deprive him of the benefit which had been given to others. Article 14 of the Constitution of India, in a situation of that nature, will not be attracted as it is well settled that law leans in favour of those who are alert and vigilant.

8. In *Union of India and others v. M. K. Sarkar*, (2010) 2 *SCC 59*, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has ruled that when a belated representation in



CWP-27351-2025

CWP-27410-2025

-5-

regard to a 'stale' or 'dead' issue/dispute is considered and decided, in compliance with a direction by the court/tribunal to do so, the date of such decision cannot be considered as furnishing a fresh cause of action for reviving the 'dead' issue or time-barred dispute. The issue of limitation or delay and laches should be considered with reference to the original cause of action and not with reference to the date on which an order is passed in compliance with a Court's direction. Neither a court's direction to consider a representation issued without examining the merits, nor a decision given in compliance with such direction, will extend the limitation, or erase the delay and laches.

10. Moreover, with regards to issues regarding fixation of pay, the position of law has been settled by a two-Judge Bench Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M.R. Gupta v. Union of India, (1995) 5 SCC 628* and has been reaffirmed by a full bench decision of this Court in *Saroj Kumari v. State of Punjab, 1998(3) SCT 664*. Accordingly, so long as an employee *is in service*, a petition claiming re-fixation of pay is not barred by limitation or the doctrine of laches, as the denial of benefit occurs every month when the salary is paid, thereby giving rise to a fresh cause of action, based on continuing wrong. Such a case is not a case of one time action like the case of termination or dismissal from service. However, payment of arrears can be restricted to a reasonable period. Three years and two months has been considered to be a reasonable period as that is the period for which a person can ask for the payment of arrears before a Civil Court. However, once an employee *ceases to be in service*, the wrong fixation of pay can no longer be treated as a continuing wrong. Consequently, a petition seeking such fixation, if instituted after cessation of service and with



substantial delay, is liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches. Reliance can be placed on the judgement of the co-ordinate bench of this Court in *Prem Nath v. State of Punjab, 2018(2) SCT 687*, wherein the petitioners approached this Court seeking correct fixation of pay much subsequent to their superannuation. While dismissing the petition on the ground of delay and laches, the Court held as follows:

“10. The reliance placed by counsel upon the judgment in Saroj Kumar's case, is wholly misplaced. The observations and aspect of delay in Saroj Kumar's case, were in the light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in M.R. Gupta v. Union of India and others, 1996(1) S.C.T 8 : 1995(4) RSJ 502. In M.R. Gupta's case (supra), it had been categorically held that so long as an employee "is in service" a fresh cause of action arises every month when he is getting his monthly salary on the basis of a wrong calculation made contrary to rules. It was further held that the claim to be awarded the correct salary on the basis of a proper pay fixation "is a right which subsists during the entire tenure of service"

11. In the present case, however, the petitioners choose not to agitate their claim while in service. It is much subsequent to their superannuation that they have woken up and seek to gain impetus from certain decisions that may have been rendered in the case of similarly situated employees.” (emphasis supplied)

11. In the present case, the petitioner(s) has approached this Court after a considerable lapse of time. Repeated representations will not keep the issues alive and no plausible explanation has been offered by learned counsel for the petitioner for the delay in filing the present petition.



CWP-27351-2025
CWP-27410-2025

12. In view of the discussion above, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its extraordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.
13. A photo copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

15.09.2025
Neha

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