



105 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-7695-2025

Date of Decision :18.08.2025

Roshan Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

Present: Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Anshul Labana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

**TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)**

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the order, dated 12.03.2025, whereby the petitioner's services have been ordered to be terminated.

2. Learned senior counsel contends that the petitioner was appointed as Workshop Attendant on contract basis in the respondent-Department on 22.08.2007. His services were, however, terminated vide impugned order dated 12.03.2025, with reference to the judgment, dated 21.02.2017, rendered by this Court in CWP-18930-2014 titled *Subhash Chand v. The Director of Industrial Training Institute and others*. However, while setting aside the petitioner's appointment, this Court issued a direction, '*... Insofar as fate of the fourth respondent (petitioner herein) appointment is concerned, it is for the selecting and appointing authority to consider if the vacancy of Workshop Attendant is available, the fourth respondent (petitioner herein) may be appointed to the post of Workshop Attendant. If he is appointed in such circumstance, petitioner would be senior to the fourth respondent for extending all service benefits. ...*'

The direction was reiterated by the Division Bench, vide order dated



22.11.2024, passed in LPA-780-2024 titled *Roshan Lal v. State of Haryana and others.*

3. Pursuant to interim order, dated 07.07.2025, passed by this Court, the petitioner has now been given a fresh appointment in the same Department as Workshop Attendant on contract basis through the Haryana Kaushal Rozgar Nigam Limited, vide office order dated 01.08.2025.

4. In these circumstances, it is further contended that the petitioner does not claim remuneration/salary for the break period, but he should be given the benefit of continuity in service from the date of initial appointment. Accordingly, his salary may be fixed by taking into account his experience of more than ten years with effect from 22.08.2007.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, contends that the petitioner has been issued a fresh deployment offer letter dated 15.08.2025 on the monthly salary of ₹23,900. This has been done in terms of memo, dated 06.09.2024, issued by the Nigam which allows this salary only to the persons having more than ten years of service. And after taking into account the petitioner's past experience, the offer letter has been issued.

6. In view of statement made, learned senior counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.

7. Ordered accordingly.

August 18, 2025

*ps*

**(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*