



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

204

CWP-35052-2019

Date of Decision:- 19.05.2026

HARINDER SINGH BHANGOO

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present:- Mr. Abhishek Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumeet Jain, Additional A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Mahesh Dheer, Advocate (arguing counsel)

Mr. Dheeraj Siwach, Advocate for respondents No.4 and 5.

Mr. Ranjit Singh Kalra, Advocate (arguing counsel)

Ms. Mona Yadav, Advocate for respondent No.6.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. The only issue which remains to be adjudicated in the present petition is whether the refusal of the State Government to grant the benefit of LTC for the Block Year 2012-2015 is justified on the ground that the claim was not raised within the stipulated period of time.

2. After hearing learned counsel for the rival parties, we are of the considered view that no time frame has been provided within which a claim for LTC is to be made, either under the instructions issued from time to time by the State of Haryana or under any other statutory provision governing such claims.

3. In view of above, this Court sets aside the impugned order dated



16.09.2019 (Annexure P-8), whereby the claim of the petitioner for LTC was rejected on a new ground that there is no authorization from the pension sanctioning authority. Thus, two divergent reasons have been assigned by two different authorities i.e. the Bank and the State Government.

4. Since the matter pertains to the claim of LTC by a Judicial Officer, we direct respondent No.1-Secretary to Government of Haryana, Department of Personnel, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh to reconsider the entire claim of the petitioner with an open mind and on the basis of executive instructions issued by the State of Haryana from time to time.

5. We make it clear that authority considering the LTC claim ought not to be influenced by the fact of petitioner having approached this Court or this Court having passed the present order.

6. The aforesaid exercise of consideration be completed within a period of two months from today by passing a speaking order and communicating the same to the petitioner within the aforesaid period.

7. Petition stands disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

19.05.2026
S.Sharma

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No