



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

119

LPA-3389-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision: August 18, 2025

H.R. Batra (Retd.)

.....Appellant (s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Rose Gupta, Advocate;
Mr. Prateek Garg, Advocate and
Ms. Sheenam Bauchita, Advocate for the appellant(s).

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA J. (ORAL)

This appeal arises out of an order passed by learned Single Judge, on 26.09.2024 in CWP No.18404-1994, whereby appellant's claim for promotion to the post of 'Principal' on the stand of the parity with the private respondents, has been rejected.

2. Learned Single Judge has taken note of the relevant provisions of *Haryana Technical Education Department (Group 'A') Service Rules, 1986*, which specifies the qualification required for promotion to the post of 'Principal' as five years' experience as HoD in Pharmacy. In Para 3 of the order, learned Single Judge has noticed that the private respondents with whom parity was being claimed by the appellant, were senior to the appellant in as



much as they were promoted as such, prior in time. The finding contained in Para 3 of the order passed by learned Single Judge is reproduced as under:-

“ 3 It is apparent on record that the petitioner was appointed as HoD in Pharmacy on 12.03.1992, whereas the third respondent was appointed as such on 21.02.1991 and the fourth respondent on 22.06.1988. Accordingly, both the private respondents were senior to the petitioner as HoD. They were promoted as Principal from 08.06.1993/25.08.1994 and 17.12.1991, respectively. The petitioner was so promoted after them in October 1998. His claim to be promoted as Principal from the date third and fourth respondent were so promoted, is not maintainable since none of them was his junior.”

3. Though various submissions are advanced by learned counsel for the appellant but the findings contained in Para 3 of the order passed by learned Single Judge, are not shown to be factually incorrect or perverse. Once that be so, it cannot be said that the private respondents were not senior to the appellant. Claim of the appellant for promotion, in these circumstances, has rightly been negated by learned Single Judge.

4. Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

5. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

August 18, 2025

sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No