

2026:PHHC:055030-DB



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

147

LPA-961-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.04.2026

Sohan Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd, Patiala and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. Simardeep Singh Bedi, Advocate for the appellant.

VIKAS SURI, J.

CM-2384-LPA-2026

This is an application for condonation of delay of 03 days in filing the appeal.

For the grounds set out in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed and the delay of 03 days in instituting the appeal is condoned.

LPA-961-2026

1. The present intra-court appeal, under clause X of the Letters Patent, has been filed against the judgment dated 23.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition for issuance of mandamus directing the respondents to furnish the service book record of the appellant/writ petitioner for the period 13.07.1988 to 21.01.1992, has been dismissed.

**LPA-961-2026**

2. Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that the appellant joined the service of respondent-corporation as a work charge gardener on 13.07.1988 at Ladhuka Sub-Division, Tehsil and District Fazilka. In the year 1990-1991, he was transferred to Sub Urban, Sub-Division at Fazilka. The appellant on being relieved from Sub-Division, Fazilka, on 21.01.1992 and joined at Sub-Urban Division, Ferozepur on the post of oiler and cleaner. It is contended that the appellant's service book remained at Sub-Urban, Sub-Division, Fazilka and on attaining the age of superannuation, he retired on 01.07.2015 as Junior Engineer from 66 K.W. Sub Station, Fazilka Division. It is further contended that though the appellant was entitled to time bound benefit of promotional scale introduced by the erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board, vide finance circular No.197/Fin/PRc-1988 dated 23.04.1990, but he was not granted the benefit of advance promotional increment after completion of 23 years of his regular service. It is alleged that the same was on account of the absence of service record for the afore-mentioned period, between 1988-1992. The appellant had also made a representation on 26.07.2021, which did not yield any result. Thereafter, the appellant got served a legal notice dated 06.11.2025 (Annexure P-1), which was responded to by the respondent-corporation vide reply dated 02.12.2025 (Annexure P-3). It was noticed therein that the record at Sub-Division Ladhuka, where the appellant had worked as work charge, could not be traced and in the cash book record of salary payment at Sub-Division Sub Urban, Fazilka, for the period 07-1991 to 12-1991, only the name of Sh. Sohan Singh was mentioned without parentage. The duplicate service

**LPA-961-2026**

sheet for the aforesaid period could only be prepared after due verification and the appellant was asked to provide any attendance related documents for the said purpose. It was conceded that the appellant joined the erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board as oiler and cleaner on 22.01.1992 and was promoted as SSA on 18.04.1997. Having been granted a promotion after completing 05 years, the appellant was not entitled to 09 years benefit. However, the 16 years benefit had already been granted to the employee on 22.01.2008. Reference was also made to finance circular No.14/2010 dated 17.03.2010, which made passing of Powercom papers mandatory for the grant of 23 years benefit, but the appellant has not passed the said papers. The 23 years benefit became due on 22.01.2015, subject to passing of Powercom papers and the appellant retired on 01.07.2015.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant further contended that the appellant had duly represented to the respondent-corporation on 26.07.2021 which was followed by a legal notice dated 06.11.2025 and the cause of action has accrued to the appellant/writ petitioner on receiving the response thereto vide letter dated 02.12.2025. It is, thus, urged that the writ petition instituted by the appellant was not barred by delay or laches.

4. On an advance copy having been served upon the respondents, Mr. Harshit Jain, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondents. Learned counsel for the respondents has defended the impugned judgment. He would submit that the appellant/writ petitioner has approached the Court at a very belated stage and law only helps those



LPA-961-2026

who help themselves and do not sleep over their right. It is further submitted that appellant is seeking old record for the years 1988 to 1992 which is more than 20 years old and is not traceable. It is further submitted that the appellant joined regular service on 20.01.1992 as oiler and cleaner and retired on 01.07.2015. Even the claim regarding the grant of time bound advance promotional increment after 23 years of service is barred by afflux of time, hence, the writ petition has been rightly dismissed.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book, with their able assistance.

6. Admittedly, the appellant retired on 01.07.2015 and is seeking the record of his service as work charge for the period from 13.07.1988 to 21.01.1992, from the various stations where he had worked as such. The said record is stated to be foundational for the appellant to claim the 23 years benefit which became due on 22.01.2015 subject to passing of Powercom paper. No material has been placed on record or brought to our notice that the appellant had ever passed the said mandatory Powercom papers. The learned Single Judge on applying the principles of law laid down in ***Chairman/Managing Director, U.P. Power Corporation Limited and others vs. Ram Gopal***, reported in (2021) 13 SCC 225, ***Mrinmoy Maity vs. Chhanda Koley and others***, reported in AIR 2024 SC 2717, ***State of Uttaranchal vs. Shiv Charan Singh Bhandari***, reported in (2013) 12 SCC 179 and ***Union of India and others vs. M.K. Sarkar***, reported in (2010) 2 SCC 59, concluded that the appellant had approached the writ Court after a considerable lapse of time



LPA-961-2026

and no plausible explanation has been offered for the delay in filing the writ petition. It was thus held that repeated representations will not keep the issues alive and the writ petition was dismissed.

7. Learned counsel for the appellant has not disputed the factual aspect. The solitary contention raised on behalf of the appellant is that the writ petition was instituted in the month of December 2025, i.e. immediately after receiving the response dated 02.12.2025 to the legal notice. Even before this Court, no explanation is forthcoming for the delay in approaching the writ Court with regard to a service benefit, which as per the appellant, became due to him on 22.01.2015, i.e. before he retired on 01.07.2015 on attaining the age of superannuation. As per the own showing of the appellant, a representation had been made on 26.07.2021 followed by legal notice dated 06.11.2025.

8. It is trite law that repeated representations do not keep the issues alive and a stale claim cannot be revived even if a representation, filed at a belated stage, is subsequently decided by the authority concerned. The same would not overcome the fetters that are applied to the remedy on account of delay and laches, on the part of the litigant seeking to raise a belated claim or revive any dead issues. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Surjeet Singh Sahni vs. State of U.P. and others***, (2022) 15 SCC 536, has held as under:

“5. As observed by this Court in catena of decisions, mere representation does not extend the period of limitation and the aggrieved person has to approach the Court expeditiously and within reasonable time. If it is found that the writ petitioner is guilty of delay and laches, the High Court should dismiss it at the threshold and ought not to



LPA-961-2026

dispose of the writ petition by relegating the writ petitioner to file a representation and/or directing the authority to decide the representation, once it is found that the original writ petitioner is guilty of delay and laches. Such order shall not give an opportunity to the petitioner to thereafter contend that rejection of the representation subsequently has given a fresh cause of action.”

9. Learned counsel for the appellant has failed to show that the conclusion arrived at by the learned Single Judge is perverse, either on the facts or the law. Concededly, the cause of action first accrued to the appellant/writ petitioner on 22.01.2015 and also on 01.07.2015 upon his retirement. In case, the appellant was aggrieved by non grant of any service benefit or inaction on the part of the department, he is expected to approach the Court within reasonable time. The writ petition was filed in December 2025, i.e. after a period of more than 10 years.

10. Even otherwise, we are of the considered opinion that the present appeal is devoid of merit and the same deserves to be rejected.

11. In view of the aforesaid, the present appeal stands dismissed.

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

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

08.04.2026

sumit.k

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes No

Whether Reportable :

Yes No