



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

LPA No.977 of 2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 21.07.2025

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS .....Appellants  
Versus  
RAM PARKASH YADAV .....Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG, Punjab  
for the applicant-appellants.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

**CM-2425-LPA-2025**

This application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 431 days in filing the appeal.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the case was considered by several officials as to whether it would be a fit case for filing the appeal and therefore, the delay had occurred in filing the appeal.

3. Heard.

4. The application preferred by the appellant for condonation of delay appears to be weak and nebulous. It is apparent that the proper explanation has not been set out in the application and the only ground set out in the application is that the case was processed at several stages but that by itself would not be sufficient to condone the inordinate delay of 431 days.

5. Consequently, we do not find any good ground to condone the



delay of 431 days in filing the appeal and the same stands dismissed.

**LPA No.977 of 2025 (O&M)**

After having heard learned counsel the appellants at some length, we deem it appropriate to consider the merits of the appeal as well.

2. The appellants have impugned the order dated 30.11.2023 passed by the learned Single Bench of this Court in CWP-1941-1997, whereby the writ petition preferred by respondent was allowed.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the respondent was not entitled to the benefit of additional increment and therefore, the error in granting him the said benefit had been rectified by order dated 21.12.1996.

4. We have heard learned counsel for the appellants and perused the material on record. The respondent was working as Art and Craft Teacher. He had been granted the revised pay scale w.e.f. 01.01.1986 and the pay was fixed at Rs.1640/-. Thereafter, on completion of 8 years of service, he was granted the additional increment and his basic pay was accordingly fixed at Rs.1680/-. However, the appellants by the order dated 21.12.1996, had withdrawn the benefit of additional increment granted to the respondent on the ground that no higher or additional responsibilities had been placed upon the respondent and, therefore, he was not entitled for the same.

5. We are of the considered view that there is no justification whatsoever to withdraw the additional increment which had been accorded to the respondent after completion of 8 years of service. The Assured Career Progression Scheme adopted by the appellants stipulates that the employees



would be entitled to additional increment after 8/18 years of service. The object of the scheme is to address the problem of stagnation due to lack of promotional avenues.

6. In view of the above, we do not find any manifest illegality in the order of the learned Single Bench allowing the writ petition and holding that the respondent was entitled to the additional increment on completion of 8 years of service and to all the consequential benefits in accordance with law.

7. Consequently, the instant Letters Patent Appeal being devoid of any merits, stands dismissed. All pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)  
JUDGE**

**21.07.2025**

*sandeep*

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No