

CWP-11169-2026

2026:PHHC:055976



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

132

CWP-11169-2026

Date of Decision: 10.04.2026

Parshotam Lal

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State Of Punjab And Others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present:- Mr. K.L. Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction, especially in the nature of *certiorari*, thereby quashing the prejudicial part i.e. “notional basis” and “no work no pay” of the orders dated 20.06.2024 (Annexure P-5) and 07.08.2024 (Annexure P-6). The case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the following authorities: (a) Single Bench judgment of this Court decided on 12.09.2025 reported as **2025 (3) Law Herald-SB-2617, Ravish Kumar Vs. State of Punjab & another** (Annexure P-10); (b) Single Bench judgment of this Court decided on 06.03.2026 in CWP No. 6626 of

CWP-11169-2026

2026:PHHC:055976



2026, *Amrik Singh Vs. State of Punjab & others* (Annexure P-11); (c) Division Bench judgment dated 08.08.2005 reported as **2005(4) SCT-DB-618**, *Rameshwar Vs. State of Haryana and others* (Annexure P-12); (d) Division Bench judgment dated 02.05.1997 (Annexure P-13); and (e) judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided on 31.08.2015 in Civil Appeal No. 811 of 2007, *Ramesh Kumar Vs. Union of India and others*.

It is further prayed that a writ in the nature of *mandamus* be issued directing the respondent authorities to release the actual benefits of promotion to the post of Junior Engineer w.e.f. 16.02.2001, Assistant Corporation Engineer (SDO) w.e.f. 22.12.2011 and Corporation Engineer (XEN) w.e.f. 06.07.2020, along with all consequential benefits and that the respondents be directed to consider and promote the petitioner to the post of S.E. w.e.f. 07.07.2024 instead of 26.08.2025, along with all consequential benefits. It is further prayed that the arrears of salary becoming due and payable on account of allowing of the present writ petition be ordered to be paid along with interest @ 18% per annum, in terms of the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **R.S. Randhawa** case reported as 1997(3)-RSJ 318, along with all consequential benefits of salary.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner shall file a comprehensive representation within a period of two weeks, and the same be directed to be considered and decided by respondent No. 2 in accordance with law, in the light of the following judgments:-

CWP-11169-2026

2026:PHHC:055976



- **2025 (3) Law Herald-SB-2617, Ravish Kumar Vs. State of Punjab & another** (Annexure P-10);
- Single Bench judgment of this Court decided on 06.03.2026 in CWP No. 6626 of 2026, **Amrik Singh Vs. State of Punjab & others** (Annexure P-11);
- Division Bench judgment dated 08.08.2005 reported as **2005(4) SCT-DB-618, Rameshwar Vs. State of Haryana and others** (Annexure P-12);
- Division Bench judgment dated 02.05.1997 (Annexure P-13)
- Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court decided on 31.08.2015 in Civil Appeal No. 811 of 2007, **Ramesh Kumar Vs. Union of India and others.**

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Vikas Sonak, learned AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 and Mr. Abhilaksh Gaiind, Advocate with Ms. Priya Jarial, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.3.

5. Therefore, in view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file a comprehensive representation within a period of two weeks, and the same shall be considered and decided by respondent No. 2/competent authority within a further period of three months, in the light of the judgments Annexures P-10 to P-13 (*supra*). The controversy also stands squarely covered by the authoritative pronouncement of the Full Bench of this Court in **A.S.**

CWP-11169-2026

2026:PHHC:055976



Randhawa, Superintending Engineer (Retd.) vs. State of Punjab, 1998 (1) SCT 343, wherein it has been unequivocally held that any delay in release of pensionary or retiral benefits beyond a reasonable period of two months from the date they become due would entail payment of interest to compensate the retiree for such delay.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

10.04.2026
Parul Verma

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No