



131

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

CM-3057-LPA-2026 & CM-3058-LPA-2026

in/and LPA-1250-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 4th May, 2026.

RAN SINGH

.....Appellant(s)

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA**
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present Mr. Amandeep Rana, Advocate,
 for the appellant.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This Appeal arises out of an order dated 30.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Bench, whereby Writ Petition i.e. CWP-816-2026, filed by the appellant, has been dismissed, declining grant of 3rd and 4th Assured Career Progression (hereinafter referred to as “ACP”).

2. It transpires that the appellant was earlier employed in the Indian Navy, having joined as Matric Entry Recruitment (MER) on 07.01.1986. He retired from the Indian Navy on 31.12.2004. Pursuant to a fresh recruitment, the appellant was appointed as a JBT Teacher on 18.01.2005. Having completed the requisite number of years, the first ACP was granted to him in the year 2014 and the second ACP was allowed w.e.f. 01.02.2021 vide order dated 11.09.2025. Thereafter, third ACP was claimed

on the ground that the appellant's service, rendered in the Indian Navy, ought to be relied upon and counted for the purposes of grant of third ACP.

3. Learned Single Bench has rejected such plea of the appellant by observing as under in para 5 of the impugned judgment:-

“5. Apparently, the petitioner joined service in the Department as JBT teacher on 18.01.2005. After rendering requisite regular service, he was given first ACP scale in 2014, and the second such scale with effect from 01.02.2021 on 11.09.2025. It is not disputed that he did not claim any service benefit on the basis of past service rendered in the Indian Navy. It is also not in dispute that there is no provision in the Haryana Civil Services (Assured Career Progression) Rules, 2016, to count military/naval service for grant of scales admissible thereunder. Accordingly, there is no basis for the petitioner's claim to third ACP scale on the strength of service rendered by him in the Indian Navy prior to joining the Department. The judgment rendered in Man Singh case (supra) does not advance his claim in any manner as past Military service was ordered to be taken into account for granting ACP scale therein on the basis of certain instructions issued by the Government with reference to old rules/Haryana Civil Services (Assured Career Progression) Rules, 2008, which are no longer in force, nor has the petitioner's case been considered thereunder.”

4. Learned counsel for the appellant placed reliance upon the judgment of the learned Single Bench passed in CWP-18917-2014, titled as **Man Singh Vs. State of Haryana and Others**, wherein reference was made to a letter dated 29.05.2009, issued by the Senior Accounts Officer (PR), Haryana Finance Department, indicating that the military service rendered

prior to joining Government service is to be counted for the purposes of seniority and pay fixation.

5. Learned Single judge has refused to rely upon such letter dated 29.05.2009 on the ground that the provision for grant of ACP to the appellant is now governed by the Haryana Civil Services (Assured Career Progression) Rules, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as “the Rules of 2016”), wherein there is no provision for counting of military services rendered earlier by the employee for the purpose of grant of ACP.

6. ACP is ordinarily to be granted to an employee on account of lack of provisional avenues in the concerned service. The object is to remove stagnation. Under the applicable Policy, ACPs are admissible on completion of 8, 16, and 24 years of regular service. The appointment of the appellant as a JBT Teacher is a fresh appointment in the State of Haryana. The ACP Rules, 2016, which govern the service condition of the appellant, do not provide for counting of any Military or Naval service rendered prior to such appointment for the purposes of grant of ACP benefits.

7. We are of the considered view that the services rendered by the appellant in the Indian Navy cannot be counted or relied upon for the grant of ACP benefits, particularly when the Rules of 2016 contain no provision permitting such inclusion. Service rendered with a different employer is not admissible for evaluating eligibility for promotion or for determining entitlement to ACP, which is a benefit granted only to address stagnation within the same service. It is, therefore, only the service rendered with the regular employer that is to be looked into and considered.

8. We, therefore, are in respectful agreement with a view taken by the learned Single Bench to non-suit the appellant with regard to his claim. Accordingly, the Appeal fails and is **dismissed**.

9. All pending applications, if any, in this case are dismissed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

May 4, 2026
Ess Kay

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>