



CWP-2758-2026

1

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

(106)

CWP-2758-2026

Date of Decision : February 16, 2026

Arvind Kumar

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. S.S. Pathania, Advocate, for the petitioner.
(joined through VC)

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 12.08.2025 (Annexure P-1) by which, claim of the petitioner for retrospective promotion w.e.f. 05.05.2011 for post of Director Regional Director Grade-A i.e. from the date respondent No.4 has been granted said promotion, has been declined.

2. It may be noticed that the promotion of respondent No.4 to the post of Regional Director Grade-A was effected on 05.05.2011 and the same had gone unchallenged at the hands of the petitioner. In the year 2013, the petitioner also got promoted to said post and continued working on the same post till he retired from service. After retirement from service, the petitioner raised a grievance that since he was senior to respondent No.4 the grant of promotion to respondent No.4 to said post in preference to the petitioner was bad, which plea has not been accepted by the Tribunal which has lead to the filing of the present petition.

3. A bare perusal of the averments made by petitioner would show that even as of now, there is no challenge to the promotion of respondent No.4 which was given to respondent No.4 in preference to the petitioner. Once, the petitioner never challenged the promotion granted to respondent No.4 on 05.05.2011 and continued working in the same status till his retirement, he cannot raise a grievance after his retirement qua the promotion of respondent No.4 so as to claim the benefits equivalent to what

**CWP-2758-2026****2**

has been granted to respondent No.4.

4. Further, even on the date when the original application was filed before Tribunal in the year 2018, the same was not maintainable being barred by expiration of prescribed limitation period. Under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the prescribed period of limitation to challenge an order is one year. It shall be noted that respondent No.4 was promoted on 05.05.2011 and there was no challenge qua his promotion upto the date the petitioner remained in service i.e. till the year 2014. Even after retirement from service, the original application was filed by petitioner after a period of four years i.e. in the year 2018 and nothing has been brought to the notice of this Court to show as to how, the said original application has been filed within the prescribed period of limitation so as to give the entitlement to petitioner to raise a plea qua a cause of action which had accrued seven years prior to the date when the original application was filed.

5. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court qua the order dated 12.08.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Tribunal declining the relief as claimed by the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

February 16, 2026
harsha

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No