



111

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

**CWP-9693-2026
DECIDED ON: 10.04.2026**

SANJIV KUMAR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. S.S. Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s)
Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG Haryana with
Ms. Amrita Singh, IAS, Development and Panchayats
Department, Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents, particularly Respondent No. 6, District Information Technology Society, Fatehabad, to forthwith release the salary/honorarium of the petitioner for the period March 2018 to June 2020 (26 months) (Annexure P- 3), which remains unpaid to the petitioner despite the petitioner having continuously worked as Village Level Entrepreneur (VLE) at the CSC established in Gram Sachivalaya, Gram Panchayat Dhani Majra, Block and District Fatehabad, and despite Respondent No. 5, Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Fatehabad, having duly submitted the Assessment Reports covering the said period to Respondent No. 6 in terms of the Tri-Party Agreement

dated 24.05.2016 (Annexure P-2), the non-payment thereof being illegal, arbitrary, in violation of the terms and conditions of the said Agreement, has caused severe financial hardship to the petitioner and that the respondents be further directed to pay the applicable penalty for delayed payment as stipulated under Article 6 of the Tri-Party Agreement; alongwith all consequential benefits to the petitioner.

2. An affidavit of Ms. Amrita Singh, IAS, Director, Rural Development Haryana, has been filed and the same is taken on record.

3. The petitioner has not set out the material facts, which is necessary for proper adjudication and has also failed to properly impleaded the necessary respondents against whom the reliefs sought in the present petition are directed.

4. In view of the above, this Court is left with no option but to dismiss the present petition.

5. However, the petitioner is granted liberty to approach this Court by way of a fresh petition, as and when complete and correct details, along with proper impleadment of necessary parties, are placed on record.

6. Ordered accordingly.

10.04.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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