



144 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CM-903-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-336-2026(O&M)
Date of decision:21.05.2026

SUBHASH

...Appellant

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

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

Present: Ms. Sunita Shekhawat, Advocate
for the appellant.

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

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

CM-903-LPA-2026

Prayer in the present application is for condonation of delay of 41
days in filing the present appeal.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and
delay of 41days in filing the present appeal is condoned.

Main case

1. This appeal assails the judgment dated 13.10.2025 of the learned
Single Judge in so far as the relief of arrears of salary for the period of ante-
dated regularization has been denied.

2. It transpires that the appellant was issued a supplementary
appointment vide order dated 01.05.2018 granting him the benefit of
regularization from a previous date as his juniors were regularized earlier. This
order in categorical terms provide that benefit of seniority and notional pay



fixation will be granted to the appellant from 05.05.2016, as his juniors were regularized on that date. There was, however, no direction to pay salary for such period. It is in this context that the learned Single Judge has observed as under:-

"3. The claim for arrears of salary has been raised on the basis of order dated 01.05.2018, which only gives him the benefit of seniority and notional pay fixation from 05.05.2016. It does not grant the arrears of salary for the period of ante-dated regularisation. Also, the petitioner never claimed the same at any stage after issuing of the supplementary appointment order, and cannot be allowed to do so now, at this belated stage."

3. Though various submissions are advanced but we find that there was no challenge to the order dated 09.02.2018 wherein the claim of wages from 2016 to 2018 had not been accepted. This order was not under challenge.
4. In such circumstances, we find no infirmity in the view taken by learned Single Judge to deny to relief to the appellant.
5. Consequently, the appeal merits no consideration and is accordingly **dismissed**.
6. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

21.05.2026

neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes
Yes

No
No