



118

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

CWP-6636-2026

Date of decision: 06.03.2026

Karanpal Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for setting aside the speaking order dated 02.06.2025 (Annexure P-25). Further, for issuance directions to the respondent-authorities to give deemed date of appointment to the petitioner on the post of AE/OT (Electrical) from the date on which his batch mates joined on the said post and release all consequential service benefits along with interest @ 9% per annum.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner applied for the post of Assistant Engineer pursuant to an advertisement dated 22.04.2021 (Annexure P-2). The petitioner remained successful and he was placed at serial No.14 of the merit list as discernible from Annexure P-4. Vide order dated 04.07.2022 (Annexure P-6), posting order was issued for selected candidates. Due to some candidates not joining or being ineligible, only 09 out of 11 general category candidates joined leaving

**CWP-6636-2026****-2-**

vacancies. The petitioner made multiple representations (Annexures P-9 to P-12) and filed CWP No.11758 of 2024 which was disposed of on 20.05.2024 (Annexure P-15) with a direction to decide his legal notice.

3. In purported compliance, his claim was rejected on 28.06.2024 (Annexure P-16). The petitioner challenged this rejection by way of filing CWP No.25442 of 2024. During its pendency, the respondents decided to offer him the appointment and the writ petition was disposed of as infructuous on 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-18). However, a liberty was granted to the petitioner to make a detailed representation for seeking notional benefits from the date, the other batch mates of the petitioner were offered appointment. The petitioner immediately submitted a letter of willingness on 17.12.2024 (Annexure P-19) and was issued an offer letter on 02.01.2025 (Annexure P-20) and an appointment letter on 04.04.2025 (Annexure P-21). The petitioner served a legal notice on 01.05.2025 (Annexure P-24) claiming deemed date of appointment from the date his batch mates joined. However, his case was rejected vide the impugned order dated 02.06.2025 (Annexure P25) by misinterpreting the order passed by this Court and his request has been declined only on the ground that his representation has not been submitted within the time frame.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that claim of the petitioner has already been considered by the respondent-Corporation and rejected vide the impugned speaking order dated 02.06.2025. It is contended that the petitioner did not submit his representation within the time period granted by this Court in its earlier order and, therefore, he is not entitled to claim the deemed date of appointment or any consequential benefits.



CWP-6636-2026

-3-

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the writ petition was disposed of on 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-18) in the presence of learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation after considering Para No.3 of the preliminary submissions of the reply filed on behalf of respondent No.2. Moreover, immediately thereafter, on 17.12.2024, the petitioner made a representation followed by a detailed representation. Thereafter, the respondent-Corporation kept the matter pending and the petitioner was issued an appointment letter only on 04.04.2025. Immediately after joining, the petitioner served a legal notice on 01.05.2025. As such, the respondents ought to have considered the claim raised by the petitioner in the legal notice by passing a speaking order. However, the impugned order dated 02.06.2025 (Annexure P-25) indicates that the claim has been rejected on a hyper-technical ground. The only reasoning given in the impugned order is that the representation was not received in the office within the time period granted by this Court.

6. In view of the above, the present writ petition is allowed. The impugned speaking order dated 02.06.2025 (Annexure P-25) is hereby set aside and the respondents are directed to consider the legal notice (Annexure P-24) and pass a well reasoned speaking order after affording him an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

06.03.2026

Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No