



110

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

LPA-610-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.03.2026

Gopal Singh ...Appellant
Vs.
State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Batra, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. Learned Single Judge has dismissed the claim of the appellant for promotion on the ground of delay.

2. The claim of the appellant for promotion is based upon alleged right that crystallized for promotion in his favour in the year 2009. This claim, however, was never agitated and the appellant continued to work as an Assistant Lineman. The appellant ultimately superannuated on 30.04.2023. It is thereafter that the writ petition has been filed in the year 2026 raising claim of promotion, which has been non-suited by the learned Single Judge relying upon the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Chairman - Managing Director, UP Power Corporation Ltd. and others vs. Ram Gopal (2021) 13 SCC 225, Marinmoy Maity vs. Chhanda Koley and others 2024 AIR SC 2717 and Prem Nath vs. State of Punjab 2018 (2) SCT 687**

3. Learned counsel for the appellant argues that in fact the service book of the appellant was misplaced due to which his claim for promotion was not accorded consideration. He also submits that the appellant had requisite qualification for the promoted post and ought to have been accorded consideration for promotion.

4. Be that as it may, it remains undisputed that the claim of the appellant for promotion relates to the year 2009. There is nothing on record to show that such claim was pressed by the appellant before the authorities when he was in service. The first representation seeking promotion is also of the year 2024. Law is well settled that mere making of representation would not defer the accrual of cause and delay of nearly 16 years would be sufficient to non-suit the appellant in the matter of claim for promotion.

5. We are, therefore, in agreement with the view taken by the learned Single Judge to non-suit the appellant. The issues with regard to eligibility for promotion etc., therefore, need not to be gone into any further. The appeal lacks merit and is dismissed accordingly.

6. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

06.03.2026
rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	:	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	:	Yes/No