

2026.PHHC:021840



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

CWP-2559-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.02.2026

Paul Chand and others

....Petitioners

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Baljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. This Court, on 30.01.2026, had passed the following
extracted order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, primarily, the impugned speaking order dated 12.12.2025 (Annexure P-2), ought to have been passed by the Secretary of the Department concerned, in compliance to the order dated 04.08.2025, rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP-22404-2025. However, the same has been passed by a junior officer, i.e. Executive Engineer. So much so, even the positive recommendations (Annexures P-8 and P-10), were gravely ignored, while drawing the impugned speaking order, thereby, illegally declining the rightful claim of the petitioners.

At this stage, without issuing a formal notice of motion, Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in Court, upon being served with an advance copy of the petition, is directed to have apt instructions on the aboveasaid aspects.

Adjourned to 12.02.2026.”

2026.PHHC:021840



3. In response, learned State counsel, while referring to the Standing Order dated 29.05.2023, fairly concedes that claim of the petitioners ought to have been disposed of, at the level of Head of the Department. Regardless, the representation preferred by the petitioners was considered by the Executive Engineer, who is lower in rank. Therefore, he submits that an opportunity may be granted to the competent authority, i.e. Head of the Department, to re-visit the entire issue, and pass an appropriate order on the representation (supra).

4. In view of the abovesaid fair stand set out by learned State counsel, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, with a Mandamus upon the Head of the Department concerned, to consider and decide the representation (supra) afresh, within 08 weeks from the receipt of a certified copy of this order.

5. Needless to assert that the Head of the Department concerned, after hearing the petitioners, shall decide their representation, independently, on its own merits, without being influenced or prejudiced, in any manner, by the speaking order dated 12.12.2025 (Annexure P-2).

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

12.02.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No