



106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CM-7053 & 7054-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-220-2026 in/and
CWP-898-2023
Date of decision: 08.05.2026

Hakam Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sumit Jain, Advocate
for the applicants-respondents.

Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the non-applicant/petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CM-7054-CWP-2026

1. This application has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of delay of 138 days in filing the review application.

2. In view of the averments made in the application, same is allowed and delay of 138 days in filing the review application is condoned.

RA-CW-220-2026

3. Present application has been filed by the applicants-respondents

under Section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 and Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking review of the order dated 11.11.2025 passed by this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants-respondents that present review application has been filed on the ground that the main petition was wrongly tagged with CWP-24236-2022, which stands disposed of vide order dated 11.11.2025 and at that time, he could not point out that the issue involved in both the petitions is distinct and altogether different. In CWP-24236-2022, impugned action pertains to cadre and allocation of *inter se* seniority between the employees of PSPCL and PSTCL, whereas in the present petition i.e. CWP-898-2023, the petitioner is claiming Advance Promotional Increment upon completion of 23 years of regular service in terms of an office order/specific policy dated 23.04.1990 issued by erstwhile Punjab State Electricity Board.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the applicants-respondents and perused the record. While issuing notice of motion in the main petition i.e. CWP-898-2023 on 17.01.2023, following order was passed by this Court: -

“Counsel for the petitioner inter alia relies upon notice of motion order passed in CWP No.25429 of 2022 which is stated to be pending for 21.03.2023.

Issue notice of motion returnable for 21.03.2023.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-PSPCL and files his memo of

appearance today in Court, which is taken on record. He prays for time to file reply as well as power of attorney.

To be heard along with CWP No.25429 of 2022.”

6. Surprisingly, neither learned counsel for the non-applicant/petitioner nor learned counsel for the applicants-respondents made a whisper with regard to the fact that there is no similarity between the claim(s) made in CWP-24236-2022 and CWP-898-2023, as such, judicial time of this Court has unnecessarily been wasted.

7. Keeping in view the fact that the issue involved in CWP-898-2023 is altogether different from the issue involved in CWP-24236-2022, instant review application is allowed. The judgment dated 11.11.2025 passed by this Court is hereby recalled qua CWP-898-2023 and the same is ordered to be restored to its original number. Registry is directed to do the needful.

8. The pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

CWP-898-2023

9. List on 30.11.2026 for arguments.

**[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE**

08.05.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No