



**CM-678-CWP-2025 and CM-679-CWP-2025 in/and  
CWP-8078-2016**

**1**

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

**(102) CM-678-CWP-2025 and  
CM-679-CWP-2025 in/and  
CWP-8078-2016  
Date of Decision : January 24, 2025**

**Ranjit Singh .. Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and others .. Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. G.S. Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)**

**CM-678-CWP-2025**

As prayed for, the application is allowed.

Delay of 61 days in re-filing the restoration application, is condoned.

**CM-679-CWP-2025**

Present application has been filed for recalling the order dated 10.09.2024, by which, the present writ petition was dismissed for non-prosecution.

Notice of the application to the counsel opposite.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, learned Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. He raises no objection for the grant of prayer as raised in the present application.



**CM-678-CWP-2025 and CM-679-CWP-2025 in/and  
CWP-8078-2016**

**2**

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the same stands allowed. The order dated 10.09.2024 is recalled and the writ petition is restored to its original number and status.

**CWP-8078-2016**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is entitled to the promotion which was not being given to him hence, prays that the respondents be directed to consider the petitioner for promotion to the post of Block Primary Education Officer on the ground that before retirement, the post was available and the petitioner was the senior most eligible candidate at the relevant time.

2. Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed the reply wherein, they have contended that the petitioner was serving on extension after having attained the age of superannuation on 30.04.2016 and as per the Instructions dated 30.10.2015 (Annexure R-1), no employee is entitled for any benefit including promotion during the period of extension hence, the claim being raised by the petitioner for the grant of promotion may kindly be rejected as mere eligibility and vacancy does not entitle an employee for promotion.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

4. Keeping in view the facts which have come on record, it is noted that no junior to the petitioner has been given the benefit of promotion to the post, which is being claimed by the petitioner being the senior most eligible employee.



**CM-678-CWP-2025 and CM-679-CWP-2025 in/and  
CWP-8078-2016**

**3**

5. It is a settled principle of law that an employee does not possess any inherent right to claim promotion. The entitlement is limited to the consideration for promotion and nothing has come on record to suggest that any employee junior to the petitioner was either been considered for promotion or has been promoted in preference ahead to the petitioner. That being the factual position, no right exist with the petitioner to claim promotion merely on the ground of eligibility and seniority.

6. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

**January 24, 2025**

*harsha*

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No