

2025:PHHC:166257



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

113

CWP-32453-2025

Date of decision: December 01, 2025

SANT KUMAR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to grant benefit of one additional increment to the petitioner.

2. On the last date of hearing, following order was passed:

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is entitled to one additional increment in terms of instructions dated 08.02.2024, as he has completed more than twenty-seven years of service as Clerk in the Department without getting any promotion. His case stands approved by the Department also, as is apparent from diary no.640 dated 21.02.2024, but the benefit has not been granted to him. This is despite the fact that similarly situated employees have been given the benefit of additional increment vide office orders dated 23.06.2025, 01.07.2025 and 02.08.2024, Annexures P-9 to P-11, respectively.



CWP-32453-2025

-2-

2. Learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, seeks an adjournment to get instructions as to why the due benefit of one additional increment has not been granted to the petitioner.
3. Adjourned to 01.12.2025.
3. Notice of motion.
4. Learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State and submits on the basis of instructions that the petitioner has been granted one additional increment vide office order dated 20.11.2025. In case he has any remaining grievance in this regard, he can submit a detailed representation to respondent no.4/Director, Secondary Education within a period of two weeks, which shall be considered and decided by passing a speaking order in accordance with law within a period of three months.
5. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.
6. Ordered accordingly.
7. In case the order is not passed within the stipulated period, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioner.

December 01, 2025

Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes/No