

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

118

LPA-961-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision : 08.10.2025

Brij Lal Singla

Versus

... Appellant

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate for the appellant.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG Punjab.

CM-2342-LPA-2024

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 08 days in re-filing the appeal.

Issue notice to the respondents.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State and submits that she has no objection if the delay is condoned.

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed and delay of 08 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

Main case

The appellant has challenged the judgment of the Single Bench dated 13.10.2023, whereby his writ petition seeking ante-dated promotion has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that as the appellant had been granted the benefit of crossing the efficiency bar on 16.06.1979 w.e.f. 31.05.1972 and on 11.06.2004 w.e.f. 01.08.1983, he ought to have been promoted as Senior Assistant either in or in 1978 or in 1984, when his juniors were promoted.

3. Heard.



4. The appellant is seeking his promotion w.e.f. 1978 or 1984. In terms of the instructions, the last five ACRs of the employee had to be taken into account for promotion. When the case of the appellant was being considered for promotion in the year 1978, his previous five ACRs including the ACR for the year 1974-75 were considered. The ACR of 1974-75 contained adverse remarks, which are reproduced hereunder:-

1974-75:- Sh. Brij Lal Singla is corrupt, un-reliable & quarrelsome. He is in the habit of roaming about and disturbing others during duty hours. He has done misappropriation of Govt funds out of Dhobi Washing Charges. His overall performance is below average.

5. If he had to be considered for promotion in 1984 then his ACR for the year 1983-84 would require to be considered, wherein he has been assessed as below average. The appellant could not even qualify the Assistant Grade Examination, which was essential requirement under the amended rules w.e.f. August, 1984. He was promoted only in the year 1991 on the basis of seniority-cum-merit.

6. We therefore, do not find any illegality in the judgment of the Single Bench declining the prayer of the appellant for promotion w.e.f. the date his juniors were promoted. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

7. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

08.10.2025

Sapna

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