

2026.PHHC.029485



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CWP-7367-2001 (O&M)

Date of decision: February 24, 2026

RAMESHWAR HOODA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ravi Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order dated 05.03.2001, Annexure P-7, whereby the petitioners' claim for grant of salary for the break period as well as counting break period for the purpose of pay fixation has been rejected. Further, a writ of *mandamus* has been sought directing the respondents not to recover the salary for the break period during their *ad hoc* service.

2. Learned State counsel contended that after rendering *ad hoc* service the petitioners were regularised in service by condoning their break periods between 01.01.1980 and 01.11.1986, as detailed in Annexure R-1. He further submitted that as recorded in the impugned order itself, pursuant to general decision taken by the Government, the petitioners were given salary for the summer vacation period and the said period stood condoned accordingly. However, they are not entitled to the second claim to count the

break period for the purpose of pay fixation, which has been rightly rejected vide the impugned order on the ground that they never worked during those periods. As per details given in Annexure R-1, the breaks were for valid reasons, including joining of regularly selected persons or the petitioners having been relieved pursuant to specific orders passed by concerned District Education Officer(s). There is no challenge to such relieving orders as well. He further contends that all break periods have already been condoned for the purpose of regularisation.

3. The facts aforementioned have not been disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners. Accordingly, there is no basis to claim benefit of *ad hoc* service for the periods during which the petitioners have not worked for various reasons. At the same time, the respondents have condoned all such breaks while granting them the benefit of regularisation. It also needs to be noted that there is no order to effect recovery from the petitioners of the benefits already given, which is under challenge.

4. In view thereof, finding no merit in the petition, it stands dismissed.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

February 24, 2026

Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)

JUDGE

✓

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*