

2025:PHHC:130797-DB



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

119

LPA-2865-2025 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 22.09.2025.

Punjab Health System Corporation

....Applicant/appellant.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Deepanshu Mehta, Advocate
for the applicant/appellant.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

CM-7214-LPA-2025

This application is for condonation of delay of 32 days in filing
the appeal.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and
delay of 32 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CM-7215-LPA-2025

Exemption application is allowed, as prayed for.

LPA-2865-2025

The appellant-Corporation has challenged the judgment of the

Single Bench dated 17.07.2025, whereby direction has been issued to release the salary of respondent No.2 for the period he had worked.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant-Corporation submits that as the age of superannuation was 60 years, respondent No.2 could not have been considered for extension in service. He, therefore, submits that respondent No.2 is not entitled for the salary for the period of one year beyond the age of 60 years.

3. Heard.

4. Respondent No.2 was posted as Peon with the appellant-Corporation. He was to retire from service on attaining the age of 60 years which he had completed on 31.07.2018. Respondent No.2 had sought extension in service while relying upon the instructions dated 08.11.2013 and 30.10.2015 issued by the Punjab Government, Department of Finance, whereby it is permissible to extend the services for another year after attaining the age of superannuation and the said request was under consideration. Respondent No.2 filed a writ petition seeking direction to grant him extension in service for a period of one year, beyond the age of 60 years. The Single Bench had granted interim relief to respondent No.2, whereby he was allowed to continue in service for a period of one year from 01.08.2018 to 31.07.2019. Admittedly, respondent No.2 had indeed worked for the afore-noted period of one year and the Single Bench has directed release of the salary for this period. We are in agreement with the judgment of the Single Bench that as respondent No.2 had worked on the post of Peon for the period of one year, he would be entitled to the salary thereof.

5. We, therefore, do not find any illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench directing payment of salary to respondent No.2 for the period he had worked as Peon. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal, being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

22.09.2025

jitender

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