



CWP-8602-2026

-1-

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

(119)

CWP-8602-2026

Date of decision:- 20.03.2026

Mangal Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present:- Mr. Supinder Singh Sohi, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Counsel for petitioners submits that the respondents have erroneously denied regular pay scale to the petitioners. He also submits that similar issue is pending adjudication before the Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) No.14124-14125-2012 and SLP (Civil) bearing Diary No.44844-2023.
2. Issue notice of motion to the respondents.
3. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Siddharth Sandhu, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the writ petitions preferred by other employees seeking the regular pay scale including ***CWP-17064-2017***, titled as '***Ajay Kumar Singla and others Vs. State of Punjab and others***', were allowed by the Division Bench of this Court on 16.02.2023. Thereafter, another writ petition bearing ***CWP-22232-2020***, titled as '***Ankush Goyal and another Vs. State of Punjab and others***', was also disposed of in same terms as the judgment in ***Ajay***



CWP-8602-2026

-2-

Kumar Singla’s case (supra). The State of Punjab has preferred SLP (Civil) bearing Diary No.44844-2023 against the judgment of this Court in case of *Ankush Goyal (supra)* and the Supreme Court has issued notice and stayed the implementation of the impugned judgment. The order of the Supreme Court dated 08.12.2023 is reproduced hereunder:

- “1. Delay condoned.
- 2. Issue notice and tag with SLP (Civil) Nos.14124-14125/2012.
- 3. Till further orders, operation and implementation of the impugned judgment shall remain stayed.”

- 4. Learned State counsel submits that the State will abide by the outcome of the SLP in the Supreme Court and the case of the petitioners would also be considered in the light of the judgment of the Supreme Court.
- 5. Heard.
- 6. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the grievance of the petitioners appears to have been substantially redressed. Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

20.03.2026
Kamal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No