



CWP-7673-2026

1

126 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-7673-2026

Date of decision: 13.03.2026

RATTAN LAL AND OTHERS

....Petitioners

Versus

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr.H.S. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pranav Chadha, Advocate
for the respondents.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (Oral):

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India for issuance of a writ especially in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-20) passed by the respondent No.5 whereby the claim of the petitioners/husband of the petitioners No.7 and 14 for counting their respective previous work charge service as mentioned in Para No.2 of the writ petition rendered by them with Respondent No. 2 as qualifying service for the purpose of pensionary benefits has been rejected in an illegal and arbitrary manner ignoring the law settled upto Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as the decision dated 18.09.2024 of Hon'ble Division Bench passed in ***"LPA No. 1996 of 2016*** titled as ***"Balbir Singh (Since deceased) through his LRs Vs B.B.M.B. & Others"*** and other connected matters.

2. The petitioners, including the husband of Petitioner No.7 and 14, were initially appointed on work-charge basis in BCB and later absorbed into BBMB without any break in service, serving continuously

**CWP-7673-2026****2**

until retirement. Despite clear instructions issued by BBMB from time to time (04.07.1991, 18.12.2012, and 25.03.2003) and Government of India directions (31.03.1982, 29.08.1984) recognizing past work-charge service as qualifying for pension and promotional benefits, the respondents arbitrarily denied this entitlement. The impugned order of 10.01.2025 is therefore illegal, arbitrary, and unjustified, and the petitioners' past service must be counted for all pensionary benefits and promotional increments.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Pranav Chadha, Advocate, has appeared on behalf of the respondents/BBMB. Without addressing the entitlement of the petitioners at this stage, he submits that the LPA No.1996 of 2016 relied upon by the petitioners is presently challenged by BBMB through Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 18714 of 2025, which is pending consideration before the Supreme Court on 10.04.2026. He further contends that the petitioners' claim cannot be acted upon by respondent/BBMB until the Supreme Court delivers its final decision in the matter.

5. In view of the pendency of the matter before the Supreme Court, this Court refrains itself from passing any mandamus. However, liberty is granted to the petitioners to approach this Court after the decision of the SLP (supra), if cause of action still survives.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

13.03.2026

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