



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

**CWP-11137-2026**

**Date of decision: 10.04.2026**

Anil Kumar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**KULDEEP TIWARI, J.** (Oral)

1) Through the instant writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a Mandamus upon the respondents to release the benefit of leave encashment to the petitioners, for the services rendered by them on work charge basis.

2) Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue arises for consideration in the matter at hand, is no more *res-integra*, as the same has already been settled by a Division Bench of this Court, vide a decision dated 21.08.2025, rendered in **LPA-2136-2025 (State of Punjab and others Vs. Sikander Singh)**. Therefore, the petitioners are entitled for the benefit of leave encashment even for the services rendered on work charge basis. In this regard, the petitioners have approached the respondent authorities by way of a legal notice dated 21.01.2026 (Annexure P-5), but till date, no final decision has been taken thereon. Accordingly, he submits that the petitioners, at this stage, would be satisfied in case the authorities concerned are directed to decide the legal notice (supra), in a time bound manner.

3. Notice of motion.



4. Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents, and waives service. At the outset, he fairly submits that he has no objection, in case, a Mandamus is passed upon the respondent concerned, to decide the legal notice (supra).
5. In view of the abovesaid stand set out by learned counsel for the parties, and since a *bona fide* and innocuous prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioners, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, by issuing a Mandamus upon competent authority, amongst the respondents, to consider and decide the legal notice (supra), within a period of six weeks from the receipt of a certified copy of this order.
6. Needless to assert that before drawing a final order, a due opportunity of hearing shall be afforded to the petitioners.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)  
JUDGE

10.04.2026  
Ak Sharma

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes    |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |