



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

CWP-26483-2023

Date of decision: 06.08.2025

Ramesh Guru and others

... petitioners

Versus

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure
Development Corporation Ltd.

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Samrat Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Parul Panchal, Advocate and
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for the respondent.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition is preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* seeking implementation of the decision dated 22-12-2011 (Annexure P-1) taken by the Board of Directors as well as the judgment passed by this Court in ***Manohar Lal Sharma and others vs. Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd. and another*** in ***CWP-6090-2013*** decided on 29.01.2015 (Annexure P-2) whereby similarly situated persons were held to be entitled to the benefits flowing from the said decision (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, submits that the petitioners is employee of the respondent-Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd. A committee of Directors, headed



by the Financial Commissioner and Principal Secretary, Industrial Department, Haryana was appointed by the Board of Directors of the respondents on 08.08.2011. On the said day, the Committee recommended pay band/grade pay equal to their counterparts in the professional stream. The recommendation was accepted in toto by the Board of Directors vide order dated 22.12.2011 (Annexure P-1). However, the decision was not implemented causing some employees to move this Court by means of CWP No. 6090 of 2013. The said writ petition was allowed vide judgment dated 29.01.2015 (Annexure P-2) and a direction was issued to the respondent to release the benefits to the petitioners therein. Aggrieved by the same, the respondent moved an LPA bearing No.1252 of 2015, which was dismissed vide judgment dated 27.08.2015(Annexure P-3). Subsequent, an SLP bearing No. 14434-14435/2017, challenging judgment dated 27.08.2015 (Annexure P-3), was moved before the Hon' ble Supreme Court which was dismissed vide order dated 11.04.2023 (Annexure P-4). Further still, a contempt petition was filed, in pursuance of which, judgment dated 29.01.2015 (Annexure P-2) was implemented qua the petitioners in CWP-6090-2013.

3. Learned counsel further argues that once the benefits have been extended to their similarly situated counterparts in terms of ***Manohar Lal Sharma and others vs. Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited and another CWP-6090-2013***, denial of the same to the petitioners is arbitrary and illegal. Reliance in this regard is placed upon the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in ***Satbir Singh vs. State of Haryana 2002 (2) SCT 354***.



4. Learned State counsel expresses his inability to controvert the judgments rendered in LPA bearing No. 1252 of 2015 as well as CWP bearing No.6090 of 2013 and submits that the respondents would not be averse to reconsidering the matter in view thereof.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. It may be profitable to refer to the legal maxim- *boni judicis est causas litium dirimere*, calls upon the Judges to endeavour to ensure that the decisions rendered do not provide avenues for further litigation. In that vein, this Court is of the considered opinion that once a competent Court has granted a certain relief to one set of employees, their similarly-situated counterparts must not be forced to move the Courts by denying them an identical relief. Furthermore, it is the duty of the Courts to maintain consistency in interpretation and application of the law. This approach is buttressed in the principle of stare decisis which is further derived from the legal maxim *stare decisis et non quieta movere* rendered as-to stand by decisions and non disturb settled matters. Therefore, judicial decisions rendered prior in time ought to be followed scrupulously.

7. As such, in view of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the matter at hand, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioners within a period of 3 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. The decision thereof shall also be communicated to the petitioners immediately. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondents.



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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

06.08.2025

Neha

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