



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

114**LPA-2878-2025 (O&M).****Date of Decision: 16.10.2025.**

Dr. Surinder Singla

....Appellant.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

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

Present: Mr. Mohit Sadana, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**CM-7248-LPA-2025**

Application is allowed, as prayed for and documents Annexures A-1 to A-4 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CM-7249-LPA-2025

This application is for condonation of delay of 215 days in filing the appeal.

Issue notice in the application.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice and submits that he has no objection in case the delay in filing the appeal is condoned.

Heard.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 215 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-2878-2025

The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench dated 16.01.2025, whereby his writ petition for grant of ACP w.e.f. 01.01.1996 has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant, who was working as a ‘Doctor’ had been performing his duties diligently. The appellant had also been honoured at a State Level Function for his contribution in the field of medicine and therefore, he was eligible for the benefit under the ACP Scheme.
3. Heard.
4. It is true that the appellant was working as a Doctor and would be entitled for promotion in the year 1996 provided his service record was satisfactory. However, the service record of the appellant was not satisfactory, which has been specifically stated in the written statement filed by the respondents. The ACRs of the appellant prior to 1996 had been taken into account by the respondents to arrive at a conclusion that he is not fit for promotion. The appellant has sought grant of ACP benefit which is permissible to only those employees who are otherwise fit for promotion but cannot be promoted for want of vacant post. The appellant had been granted ACP benefit w.e.f. 1999 after taking into account his previous service record, which had improved during that period. We are in agreement with the judgment of the Single Bench that as the service record of the appellant was not satisfactory, he had rightly been denied the benefit of ACP in the year 1996.
5. Consequently, we do not find any illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench and 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

16.10.2025
jitender

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