

2026.PHHC:001128



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

109

CWP-37372-2025

Date of decision: January 09, 2026

NAND LAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Karamveer Singh Banyana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order dated 09.10.2025, whereby the petitioner's claim for grant of two years extension in service has been rejected on the ground that the disability he is suffering from, is less than seventy per cent. Consequently, he does not meet the requirement under Rule 143(1)(i) of the Haryana Civil Services Rules, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2016 Rules').

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a physically-challenged employee. He was recruited as Mathematics Master under the Physically Handicapped category, as apparent from his appointment letter dated 21.02.1994, Annexure P-1. His Disability Certificate dated 16.01.2002, Annexure P-2, certifying his permanent disability to be forty per cent, is also on record. Rule 143 of the 2016 Rules has now been read down by the Division Bench vide judgment dated

06.11.2025, rendered in CWP-2340-2023 titled *Jora Singh v. State of Haryana and others*, holding that employees suffering from permanent disability of forty per cent and above will be entitled to extension of two years in service in terms therewith. Accordingly, the petitioner, who is due to superannuate on 28.02.2026, is entitled to extension in service. He made a representation dated 26.11.2025, Annexure P-6, which has neither been decided by respondent no.2, nor has extension been granted to him.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State and contends that appropriate decision on the petitioner's representation will soon be taken in the light of the law laid down by the Division Bench in the judgment aforementioned.

5. In view of the statement made, the petition is disposed of directing the second respondent to decide the issue of granting extension in service to the petitioner by considering his representation at the earliest, and in any case not later than two weeks prior to the date of his superannuation.

6. In case the order is not passed within the stipulated period, the officer concerned shall pay costs of ₹50,000 to the petitioner.

January 09, 2026

Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*