



**CM-1851-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-735-2026**

1

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

(104)

**CM-1851-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-735-2026**

Date of Decision : March 24, 2026

**Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab Technical University and others
.. Appellants**

Versus

Ravinder Pal and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL**

Present: Mr. D.S. Bhinder, Advocate with
Ms. Indira, Advocate, for the appellant.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

CM-1851-LPA-2026

Present application has been filed seeking condonation of delay
of 70 days in filing the appeal.

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which
are duly supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed. Delay of 70
days in filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-735-2026

1. In the present Letters Patent Appeal, the challenge is to the
order dated 27.10.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in CWP
No.19742 of 2018 by which, respondents No. 2 to 6 i.e. appellants herein
have been directed to release the amount admissible to the petitioners which
has been withheld so as to put them in the same bracket as Harmanpreet



**CM-1851-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-735-2026**

2

Kaur and Rajesh Kumar, as payment due to them has already been released, for grant of which payment, a claim was raised before the learned Single Judge.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the appellants was asked as to whether, the respondents herein, who were the petitioners before the learned Single Judge, are similarly situated as Harmanpreet Kaur and Rajesh Kumar, whose description has been given by the learned Single Judge in paragraph 7 of the impugned order dated 27.10.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants has not been able to dispute the said fact.

4. Once, the similarly situated employees have been granted the dues admissible to them by the appellants themselves, which benefit has been allowed in favour of the respondents herein by the learned Single Judge, no ground is made out for any interference, as accepting plea of the appellant, same will amount to discrimination between similarly situated employees.

5. No other arguments have been raised.

6. Keeping in view the above, the present appeal is dismissed.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

March 24, 2026
harsha

**(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No