



*LPA-328-2019 (O&M); LPA-544-2019 (O&M)*

Page 1 of 4

219

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

1.

**LPA-328-2019 (O&M)**

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

. . . . Appellants

**Vs.**

LAL SINGH AND ANR

. . . . Respondents

\*\*\*\*

2.

**LPA-544-2019 (O&M)**

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

. . . . Appellants

**Vs.**

KIRORI MAL

. . . . Respondent

\*\*\*\*

**Date of Decision: 20.02.2025**

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana  
for the appellants.

Mr. B.S. Mittal, Advocate  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)**

- Learned counsel appearing for the respondents/original writ petitioners submits that the Hon'ble Single Judge decided three writ petitions i.e. *CWP-9369-2017 titled as 'Lal Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and others'*, *CWP-9370-2017 titled as 'Kirori Mal vs. State of Haryana and others'* and *CWP-9371-2017 titled as 'Suresh Chand alias Suresh Kumar vs. State of Haryana and others'*, together on 07.08.2018, incorporating the same judgment in all the three decisions separately.



**LPA-328-2019 (O&M); LPA-544-2019 (O&M)**

**Page 2 of 4**

2. The State of Haryana filed three LPAs challenging the order of the Single Judge. The first appeal bearing LPA No.297 of 2019 came up before the Division Bench headed by Hon'ble The Then Chief Justice, HMJ Krishna Murari, and the Court passed the following order on 07.02.2019:

*“2. Regularization of services of the respondent has been directed on the strength of a judgement of the learned Single Judge in CWP-14111-2001 titled as Pardeep Kumar and others vs State of Haryana and others decided on 18.05.2009 which was passed on identical facts and circumstances. The judgement rendered in the case of Pardeep Kumar (supra) came to be affirmed by a Division Bench judgement dated 25.01.2010 rendered in LPA-91-2010.*

*3. Since the issue involved in the present appeal is same as the one which stands answered by the Division Bench judgement dated 25.01.2010 in LPA-91-2010, with which we are in respectful agreement, this appeal also stands dismissed on the same terms and the reasoning as assigned therein.”*

3. The second appeal bearing LPA No.328 of 2019 came up before the Court on 01.03.2019, and the following order was passed:

*“Notice of motion for 11.07.2019.*

*Steps to serve the respondents be taken.*

*Till the next date of listing, the effect and operation of the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge shall remain in abeyance.”*

4. On 01.03.2019, the Court was not informed by the Additional Advocate General appearing for the State of Haryana that similar LPA



*LPA-328-2019 (O&M); LPA-544-2019 (O&M)*

Page 3 of 4

No.297 of 2019 has already been dismissed on 07.02.2019, though he was appearing in the same case.

5. The third LPA bearing LPA No.544 of 2019 also came up before the Division Bench on 18.03.2019, and the same Bench was informed that on identical facts, notice of motion has been issued in LPA-328-2019, and interim order was therefore passed in the same terms as passed in LPA-328-2019. Again on that day, the Division Bench was not informed about the other identical LPA No.297 of 2019 which stood already dismissed on 07.02.2019, and the same counsel, Additional Advocate General appearing for the State of Haryana was appearing in the same LPA.
6. Resultantly, so far as the judgment passed by the Single Judge in *Suresh Chand alias Suresh Kumar (supra)* stood upheld, the other two orders passed on the same day in the aforesaid two writ petitions were stayed, obviously as the Division Bench was not informed about its earlier order passed on 07.02.2019.
7. The Court functioning is largely dependent on the statements made by the Law Officers. The Additional Advocate Generals appearing for the Government are required to act responsibly, and it cannot be said that their personal interest is involved in such litigations. They have to be fair to the Court. However, the approach adopted as noticed above is most unfortunate.
8. We need not say anything further, as the said counsel is not before us today. However, we will have to set the things right and correct our



***LPA-328-2019 (O&M); LPA-544-2019 (O&M)***

**Page 4 of 4**

own mistake. We therefore, ***dismiss*** both these appeals in the same terms as passed in LPA No.297 of 2019, decided on 07.02.2019.

9. Interim orders passed by this Court shall stand vacated.

10. All pending applications also stand disposed of accordingly.

**(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)**  
**JUDGE**

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)**  
**JUDGE**

**20.02.2025**

*Mohit goyal*

1. *Whether speaking/reasoned?*  
2. *Whether reportable?*

***Yes/No***  
***Yes/No***