

2025:PHHC:096418



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

**COCP-4736-2024 (O&M)
Decided on:-29.07.2025**

Satish Kumar

....Petitioner..

vs.

Jagidsh Chander, IFS Principal Chief Conservator
of Forest Department, Haryana

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr.Surinder Kumar Daaria, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Dutt Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. At the very outset, learned State counsel submits that the controversy similar to the present one came up for adjudication before a Division Bench of this Court in a batch of appeals, the lead case being LPA No.105 of 2025 (O&M), titled as ***“State of Haryana and others vs. Damyanti”***, which were decided vide order dated 14.05.2025 in the following manner:-

“1. All these matters relate to the issue on two aspects, one is with regard to grant of the benefit of Old Pension Scheme to the writ-petitioners and the other is with regard to giving them the benefit of regularization Policy dated 01.10.2003 without considering whether they have worked for 240 days in each of the three years preceding the date of Policy.

2. Relying on the law, a Division Bench of this Court passed an order in LPA No.2356 of 2024 decided on 26.09.2024 titled as

“State of Haryana and others vs. Sher Singh” holding the concerned writ-petitioners entitled for the benefit as claimed by them noticed above.

3. *However, we have taken note of the fact that with regard to the same set of cases, certain SLPs were preferred before the Supreme Court one of them is Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.112/2025 tilted as “State of Haryana & Ors. vs. Sushil” and the other is having Diary No.56458/2024 whereas in the meantime, the Apex Court stayed the operation and effect of the judgment. We, therefore, are of the view that we should await the final judgment to be rendered by Hon’ble the Supreme Court in these cases and the present appeals, which many of them are highly belated, need not be kept pending before us.*

4. *Accordingly, we dispose of all these appeals with observations that whatever is the final verdict rendered by Hon’ble the Supreme Court in SLP No.112/2025 shall govern the fate to all the respondents herein. It is made clear that till disposal of the said SLP, no contempt proceedings would be initiated on account of non-implementation of the order of the learned Single Judge. At the same time, the claim of the writ-petitioners would also not be frustrated if the order is ultimately passed against the State by Hon’ble the Supreme Court.*

5. *All the pending misc. application(s) in each case also stand disposed of.”*

2. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of in the same terms. Rule stands discharged.

3. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

29.07.2025
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/ No